This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NOTES ON THE RUBRICS

OF

THE ROMAN RITUAL,

REGARDING

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL, BAPTISM, THE EUCHARIST, AND EXTREME UNCTION.

BY THE REV. JAMES O'KANE,

SENIOR DEAN, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH.

DUBLIN:
JAMES DUFFY, 15 WELLINGTON QUAY;
AND
22 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.
1867.

138. f. 57.

Nihil obstat.

EDMUNDUS J. O'REILLY, S.J.,

Censor Theolog. Deputatus.

Imprimatur,

✠ PAULUS CARD. CULLEN,

Archiepiscopus Dubliniensis.

J. F. Fowler, Printer, 3 Crow Street, Dame Street, Dublin.

PREFACE.

It has been part of my duty, for several years, to give Lectures on the Rubrics of the Ritual to the Senior Class of Divinity Students. In preparing for these Lectures, I had occasion to consult the principal authorities on the various subjects treated, and in order to save the trouble of frequent references, I usually made a note of what seemed to me valuable for the purpose either of explaining the text of the Rubric, or of drawing out the instructions contained in it.

The Rubrics which regard the Sacraments in general, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Extreme Unction, claimed special attention, because they treat of those duties of the ministry that present, perhaps, most difficulties to a priest on the mission. It was suggested to me that a work explaining these Rubrics, and at the same time taking into account the difficulties that stand in the way of observing them to the letter in a

country like Ireland, would supply a want felt by many priests. With a view, therefore, to compiling a work of the kind, I some time ago revised and considerably extended my notes on these Rubrics, intending ultimately to condense and recast them, using probably the Latin language as best suited to many of the subjects of which they treat. But, having consulted one on whose judgment I place great reliance, I was induced to prepare them for the press in their present form—that in which they were first written—as on the whole the best for the purpose intended. The want of the more exact and methodical arrangement which I had contemplated, I have made an effort to supply in some degree by means of a copious Index.

The text of the Rubrics, which is that of the "Propaganda" edition of the Ritual (ROMÆ, MDCCCXLVII.), is divided, in each chapter, into sections printed in distinctive type. The Notes on the several Rubrics or sections contain the substance of what I could glean, in the way already intimated, from the authorities consulted. For the satisfactory explanation of many

Rubrics, I found it necessary not to confine myself to the mere ceremonial, but to touch on theological questions of great practical importance, and occasionally to notice questions of interest as to the origin, history, or meaning of particular ceremonies. A reference is given in every case to the works cited, so that the reader is put at once in the way of getting fuller information, should he desire it. Far, then, from wishing to present anything new or original, I have endeavoured to give a voucher, if possible, for every statement, and to use, where I could do so conveniently, the very words of the authority cited.

What might here be said on the importance of the subject matter of the volume, as well as on the sources from which the Notes are taken, will be found in the Introductory Chapter, and in the Appendix.

It only remains for me to acknowledge my obligations to the Very Rev. Edmund O'Reilly, the learned Father Provincial of the Society of Jesus, for much valuable assistance in the treatment of several questions, as well as for the

great care and trouble taken by him in revising the sheets as they passed through the press. His name is a sufficient guarantee that the book contains nothing opposed to sound theology. But if any expression has escaped me, at variance, even remotely, with the teaching and spirit of the Church, I hereby unreservedly condemn and retract it.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE,
Feast of the Epiphany, 1867.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Page.

Meaning of Rubrics: obligation of those that regard the sacraments—Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites: their authority: form: promulgation—Custom: how far it may prevail against the Rubrics: in particular against the Rubrics of the Ritual: its indirect influence in a country like Ireland—Rubricists: how their authority should be estimated . . 1—45

CHAPTER II.

SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

Ceremonies in administering the sacraments—Duties and qualifications of the minister—He must lead a pure life: must be prompt when called on—How he should be vested—Clerks to assist—Instructions on the sacraments—Attention and devotion in performing the ceremonies—Intention . . . . 46—75

CHAPTER III.

SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

Baptism—Effects—Necessity—Matter—Form in Latin Church—Form in Greek Church—Effusion, Immersion, Aspersion—Ordinary minister—Minister in necessity—Infants should be baptized soon after birth—Case of difficult parturition—Cæsarean operation—Abortive fœtus—Foundlings—Sponsors—Time and place of administering—The font—The Holy Oils—Summary of requisites—Position at the church door—Name to be given . . . . . 76—168

Page.

CHAPTER IV.

ORDER OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Interrogations to be put in Latin—Exorcisms—Sign of the cross—Use of salt—Conducting into the church—Touching with spittle—Renunciations—Unctions—Pouring on the water—Use of chrism—The white garment—Two or more infants together—In danger of death—In private houses—Admonitions to parents and sponsors—Ancient discipline regarding Confirmation and Communion—Present practice in the Greek Church . . . . . 169—228

CHAPTER V.

BAPTISM OF ADULTS.

Catechumens—Previous instruction—Dispositions required—Mysteries necessary to be believed—Deaf mutes—Sorrow for actual sin necessary—The insane—Converts from various sects—Sacramental confession—Absolution from heresy . . . . 229—264

CHAPTER VI.

ORDER OF ADULT BAPTISM.

The Church wishes adults to be baptized with great solemnity—Vestments—Prayers at the altar—Abjuration of previous errors—Signing with the cross, exorcisms, renunciations, interrogations, repeated frequently during the ceremony—Clothing in white—Neophytes should be confirmed, if there be a bishop present, and receive Communion . . . 265—297

CHAPTER VII.

ORDER FOR SUPPLYING THE CEREMONIES OMITTED IN BAPTISM.

Obligation of supplying the ceremonies omitted—Bishops may dispense with the obligation in case of adults—Changes in some of the prayers . . . 298—302

Page.

CHAPTER VIII.

RITE WHEN A BISHOP BAPTIZES.

Ministers in attendance on Holy Saturday—Ministers required at other times—Vestments—Procession to the door—When a priest performs the first part of the ceremony . . . . . 303—309

CHAPTER IX.

BLESSING OF THE FONT.

Vestments and ministers required—Litany—Form of insufflation—Infusion of the oils . . . 310—320

CHAPTER X.

BLESSING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILDBIRTH.

Origin of this blessing—Not of obligation—Place—Time—Ceremonies—Mass of Purification of B. V. M. not permitted as a votive mass . . . . 321—332

CHAPTER XI.

SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.

Dignity and excellence of this sacrament—Holy Communion—Dispositions and preparation of the communicant—Place of keeping the Blessed Eucharist—The sacred vessels—The tabernacle—The lamp—Renewal of the sacred species—Purification of the ciborium—Public sinners—Occult sinners—The insane—Communion of children . . . . . 333—394

CHAPTER XII.

ORDER OF HOLY COMMUNION.

Purification of communicants no longer in use—Communion cloth—Colour of the stole—Preparations—Ceremonies at the altar—Manner of administering in

Page.

the early Church—in the present Greek Church—Precautions in placing the Host on the tongue—Use of a purificator—Particles may be divided—Ceremonies on returning to the altar—Communion at mass—At a Requiem mass—Communion of the clergy at mass—Communion immediately before or after mass 395—449

CHAPTER XIII.

PASCHAL COMMUNION.

Precept of the Church—Who are bound by it—Where Paschal Communion must be received—Within what time—Twofold obligation of the precept—Treatment of defaulters—Easter Sunday—Strangers in a Parish—The sick . . . . . 450—473

CHAPTER XIV.

COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

Obligation of receiving Communion "in articulo mortis"—Form in administering—Viaticum may be repeatedly administered to one not fasting—Cases of delirium, cough, vomit, etc.—A person sick, but not in danger, cannot communicate unless he be fasting—Preparations in sick room—Manner of carrying the Blessed Sacrament—Vestments required—Ceremonies in administering—In very urgent necessity—Benediction with the pyxis or with the hand—Administered to two or more together . . . . . 474—528

CHAPTER XV.

SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

Effects of Extreme Unction—Dispositions for receiving it—Might be valid when absolution would not—The matter—To whom administered—How administered in urgent necessity—When it may be repeated—Parts anointed: what unctions are essential—The form: what words are essential—Is grace conferred by the unction of each organ? . . . . . 529—571

Page.

CHAPTER XVI.

ORDER OF EXTREME UNCTION.

Preparations—Formerly administered by a number of priests—Greek usage—Present usage in Western Church—How the Holy Oil is carried—The vestments—Exhortation of the sick—Prayers of those present—Administered to a number together—Viaticum, Extreme Unction, and Benediction "in articulo mortis" in immediate succession . . . . . 572—610

CHAPTER XVII.

BLESSING WITH PLENARY INDULGENCE "IN ARTICULO MORTIS".

Analysis of the bull "*Pia Mater*"—To whom the blessing may be given—Delegation of the faculty—Dispositions required—Formula to be used—Other indulgences at the hour of death . . . . . 611—624

APPENDIX.

Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites—Of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences—Of the Sacred Congregations of the Council, of the Inquisition, and of Bishops — Synodal Decrees — Works consulted 625—656

General Index 657

NOTES

ON THE

RUBRICS OF THE ROMAN RITUAL.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

§ I. ORIGIN AND MEANING OF "RUBRICS".

1. In the law books of the ancient Romans the titles and inscriptions were marked in red with a kind of mineral called "Rubrica", and hence the word "Rubricæ", applied at first to the titles or inscriptions, came in the end to signify the laws themselves.[1] The liturgical books which regulated the solemn offices of the Church were marked in the same way; and as in course of time they came to be almost the only books so marked, the word "Rubrics" came to signify almost exclusively the laws contained in these books.[2]

2. The word "Liturgy", from its etymology—λεῖτος and ἔργον—signifies "public service", or "public ministry". Applied to the offices of religion, it signifies primarily, that greatest and most excellent of all—the oblation of the holy sacrifice, or the mass. But it is used also in a more extended signification, as comprising not only

[1] Vid. Facciolati, *Lexicon.* v. *Rubrica.*

[2] Vid. Fornici, *Instit. Liturg. Notiones Præviæ*, pag. 3.

the mass and the ceremonies immediately pertaining to the mass, but the canonical hours, the administration of the sacraments, and other public functions of the clergy.[1]

3. The liturgical books contain these offices with the rubrics to be observed in them. Those now in use in the Western or Latin Church are—1° The Missal, containing the mass with the method of ordering it, and the rites and ceremonies to be observed in celebrating it. 2° The Breviary, containing the canonical hours with the method of ordering the office for each day, and the manner of reciting it. 3° The "Ceremoniale Episcoporum", containing instructions on the manner of performing certain solemn functions in cathedral or collegiate churches, when the bishop or some dignitary officiates. 4° The Pontifical, containing the functions and the ceremonies to be observed in the functions that (if we except a few for which special faculties are sometimes given) are performed only by a bishop. 5° The Ritual, containing the rites and ceremonies to be observed in administering the sacraments (except confirmation and orders, which are administered only by a bishop),[2] the office for the dead, and certain benedictions and processions. Nominally there are other liturgical books in use, but in reality they are these, or portions of these, as *e. g.* the "Antiphonarium", the "Graduale", etc., etc.

4. There are various liturgical books in use in the Greek and other oriental Churches, but the only one of these we may have occasion to refer to, is the Greek Euchologium, which contains the rites and ceremonies

[1] Fornici, ibid., pag. 1. Vid. Bouix, *De Jure Liturgico*, pars. i. cap. i. et cap. ii. 6°.

[2] Vid. infra. chap. ii. § xvii.

observed in the administration of the sacraments. It is, in fact, at once Ritual, Missal, and Pontifical.[1]

5. The distinction between "Rite" and "Ceremony" is not very accurately fixed. By "ceremony" some understand the sacred action with all its circumstances, and by "rite" the manner of performing the action, or the rules to be observed in performing it, so that the "ceremony" is the actual application of the "rite", or the actual observance of the rules laid down for the sacred action.[2] Others understand by "rite" all the words and actions that are substantial in the sacred function, and by "ceremony" those that are accidental.[3]

6. The two words, however, according to Catalani[4] and Fornici,[5] are generally used in the same sense—viz., to signify, Fornici says, the laws to be observed in public religious worship. It would be, perhaps, more exact to say that by "Rite" or "Ceremony" is now commonly understood any religious function performed according to certain laws fixed by the Church. These laws, as has been stated, are contained in the Rubrics.

7. For the present we are concerned only with the rubrics of the Roman Ritual. The book is so called because it gives the sacred functions which it contains according to the *rites* used at Rome, and was published under this title by the authority of Pope Paul V., as appears from the bull *Apostolicæ Sedi*, given at the commencement of the Ritual.[6]

[1] Cfr. Bouix, *De Jure Liturgico*, pars iv. cap. 1.

[2] Baruff. Tit., i. n. 3; Catal., Tit. i. § ii n. xiv.

[3] Vid. Fornici, l. c. pag. 2.

[4] Loc. cit. [5] Loc. cit.

[6] Baruff, l. c n. 5, et seq. Vid. Gardellini, *Annot. in Dec. S. R. C.* 27 Aug. 1836, sub. Dub. i., in *Rhedonen.* n. 4780.

8. It is shown by Bouix[1] that all the liturgies used throughout the Western Church, except the Ambrosian, retained at Milan, and the Mozarabic used in Toledo, were commonly called "Roman", before the correction made by St. Pius V. They were so called, because they all agreed substantially with the liturgy used in Rome, though differing in many things from it as well as from each other. Those that had been in use in any church for two hundred years at the time of the correction, were allowed to be retained as they were, and may therefore still, in a certain sense, be called "Roman", as they were called before. Since the correction, however, the Roman Liturgy is usually understood to be the corrected liturgy, unless where the contrary is expressed or implied by the context. Hence it is that many of the liturgical books, which differ considerably from the Roman, and are now spoken of as opposed to the Roman, were nevertheless, before the correction, included under the general name of "Roman".

9. The rubrics which regard the sacraments, embody the teaching and instructions of the Church on the qualifications and duties of the minister, the dispositions of the recipient, and the ceremonies to be performed in the actual administration. It is plain, therefore, that a knowledge of these rubrics is indispensable to a priest.

10. He acquires a good deal of this knowledge in his theological studies, for a considerable part of the theology that relates to the sacraments is occupied with the discussion of questions which are necessarily involved in the rubrics. A slight examination of the matter will

[1] *De Jure Liturgico*, pars. iv., cap. ii., § 2, prop. 1ª 2ª et 7ª.

show that the most approved decisions on these questions are sometimes embodied in the rubric, sometimes the best commentary on the text of the rubric. This is true especially of the rubrics which regard the duties of the minister and the dispositions of the recipient. There is this advantage in connecting the decisions of theology with the explanation of the rubric, that by doing so both are likely to be better remembered. The priest has the ritual constantly in his hand, and a glance at the rubric may suffice to recall to his mind the decisions connected with it; and, again, this very circumstance will induce him to recur frequently to the text of the rubric. Commentators on the rubrics, therefore, usually discuss both the moral questions which the rubrics involve and the ceremonies which they prescribe.

11. But, besides, there is a great deal in the rubrics regarding the sacraments, which is not touched on at all, or touched on very slightly, in theological treatises. This is the case with nearly all the ceremonies that do not affect the validity or integrity of the sacrament. Yet many of these ceremonies are of great importance, and must be strictly observed by the priest, who is consequently bound to know the rubrics which prescribe them. The study at least of these rubrics is distinct from the study of theology, but still is necessary to the priest, who is charged with the duty of administering sacraments.

12. Accordingly we find that "the rubrics" not only form a special branch of study in ecclesiastical colleges, but are made the subject of frequent ecclesiastical conferences by the clergy on the mission.

§ II. OBLIGATION OF THE RUBRICS.

13. Rubrics in general are divided into "preceptive" and "directive". Preceptive rubrics are those which bind under sin. Directive rubrics do not bind under sin, but simply *direct* what is to be done by way of counsel and instruction. This is the distinction as commonly understood, and as the words themselves seem to imply.

14. But some authors understand by "preceptive" rubrics, those that bind under grievous sin; and by "directive", those that bind under venial sin, at least in the sense, that to violate them without any reasonable cause would be a venial sin. Cavalieri[1] seems to understand them in this sense. St. Liguori[2] rejects this explanation as incongruous. In referring to any author on the obligation of the rubrics, it is necessary to ascertain in what sense he uses the words, otherwise his opinion might easily be misunderstood.

15. It is certain that the rubrics which regard the administration of the sacraments are, with few exceptions, preceptive. Some prescribe what is required for the substance and integrity of the sacraments. Some prescribe what is known from other sources, as *e.g.* from the decrees of councils, or the teaching of theologians, to be of strict precept. Some are expressed in a form which leaves no doubt as to the intention of the Church to make them preceptive.

16. With regard to the rest, there are strong reasons for holding that, with the exceptions to be noticed presently, they too are preceptive. This is justly inferred from the canon of the Council of Trent, cited in the very

[1] *Opera Liturgica*, Tom. v., cap. ii., *De Rubricis*, n. 2 in fine.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 399. *Tertia Sententia*, in fine.

first paragraph of the rubrics themselves:—"*Si quis* "*dixerit, receptos et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Ritus* "*in solemni Sacramentorum administratione adhiberi con-* "*suetos, aut contemni, aut sine peccato a Ministris pro* "*libito omitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque Ecclesi-* "*arum pastorem mutari posse, anathema sit*".[1] St. Liguori[2] infers from these words that the rubrics to be observed in the actual celebration of Mass are preceptive; and it is evident that the words apply with equal force, and even more directly and explictly, to the rubrics that regard the administration of the sacraments. The Roman Ritual introduces the canon in a way which leaves no doubt as to its application. "**UT EA QUÆ ex antiquis Catholicæ Eccle-** "**siæ institutis, et sacrorum canonum summorumque Pontificum** "**decretis, DE SACRAMENTORUM RITIBUS AC CÆREMO-** "**NIIS HOC LIBRO PRÆSCRIBUNTUR, qua par est dili-** "**gentia ac religione custodiantur et ubique fideliter serventur** "**illud ante omnia scire et observare convenit QUOD SACRO-** "**SANCTA TRIDENTINA SYNODUS DE IIS RITIBUS DE-** "**CREVIT IN HÆC VERBA:** *Si quis, etc.*" These words show that the Tridentine canon applies, at least, to what is prescribed by the rubrics in the actual solemn administration of the Sacraments, and, consequently, these rubrics at least are preceptive. But, in order to observe these, there are others that must be observed, and that consequently must be, at least so far, acknowledged to be preceptive.

17. We here suppose the rubrics of which there is question to be the rubrics sanctioned by the Church. That these are, for the Latin Church, the rubrics of the Roman Ritual is justly inferred from the words cited, for these words clearly convey that the rites required by the Canon of Trent to be observed are the rites prescribed

[1] Sess. vii. *can. 13.* [2] *Lib. vi. 399, Quarta Sententia.*

in this book, i.e. *in the Roman Ritual.* If the Canon of Trent could still apply to rites different from those of the Roman Ritual, it surely could not be put forward as a powerful motive why those prescribed in the Roman Ritual should be everywhere faithfully observed. The words by which the canon is introduced must, therefore, be understood to restrict the "approbatos ritus", from that time forth, to the rites prescribed in the rubrics which follow.[1] But we shall discuss the question more fully by and by.

18. The words of a decree of Benedict XIII. convey clearly enough that the rubrics of the ritual regarding the administration of the sacraments are preceptive even in the most minute details. The decree, it is true, is not addressed to the whole Church, but is given amongst the acts of the council which this Pope held at Rome in the year 1725. At the same time it must be acknowledged to have great weight in the present matter. Its words are: "Cum invisibilia Dei per visibilia Religionis ac "pietatis signa quæ cæremoniarum nomine censentur, intel- "lecta conspiciuntur, Pastoralis nostri muneris curam ad "hoc intendimus, et ab omnibus fieri volumus, et manda- "mus, ut in sacramentorum videlicet administratione, in "missis et divinis officiis celebrandis, aliisque ecclesiasticis "functionibus obeundis non pro libito inventi et irrationa- "biliter inducti, sed recepti et approbati Ecclesiæ Catholicæ "ritus *qui, in minimis etiam, sine peccato negligi, omitti vel* "*mutari haud possint*, peculiari studio ac diligentia serven- "tur; quamobrem Episcopis districte præcipimus ut contra- "ria omnia quæ in ecclesiis seu secularibus seu regularibus

[1] Vid. Bouix, *De Jure Liturg.* pars iv. cap. iii. § v. punct. iv. 3°.

"(iis exceptis quæ Rituali, vel Missali, vel Breviario u-
"tuntur a S. Sede probato) contra præscriptum Pontificalis
" Romani et Cæremonialis Episcoporum vel rubricas Mis-
"salis, Breviarii, et *Ritualis* irrepsisse compererint, detesta-
" biles tanquam abusus et corruptelas prohibeant et omnino
" studeant removere, quavis non obstante interposita appel-
" latione vel immemorabili allegata consuetudine; cum
" non quod fit sed quod fieri debet sit attendendum".[1] . . .

19. The words of Benedict XIV., speaking of the Rubrics of the Missal, are evidently applicable to the Rubrics of the Ritual as well, especially seeing that, in the decree of Benedict XIII. just cited, both are regarded as equally binding. In his work, *De Sacrificio Missæ*,[2] Benedict XIV. says: "Ipsa communis omnium sententia
" docet rubricas esse leges præceptivas quæ obligant sub
" mortali *ex genere suo* ut loquuntur theologi, ita tamen ut
" immunis sit a mortali qui eas non servat per invincibilem
" omnimodam imprudentiam et aliquando etiam propter
" parvitatem materiæ". These words express precisely the conclusion which, we think, should be adopted in practice on the obligation of the rubrics that regard the sacraments.

20. We have said there are exceptions. We must, of course, except those rubrics which are expressed in a form indicating that they are merely directive. We must except those also which there is good authority for regarding as directive. In a matter of this kind we need not expect always to have certainty. We must very often be content with a greater or less degree of probability.

[1] Conc. Rom. 1725, tit. xv. cap. i. Labbe, curante Coleti, tom. xxi. pag. 1874, Venetiis, 1733.

[2] Lib. iii. cap. xiii. n. 3.

Treating of the distinction between "preceptive" and "directive" as it affects the rubrics of the Missal, Janssens uses the following words, which clearly apply with equal force to the rubrics of the Ritual: " . . . Rubricarum "mens tum ex subjecta materia tum ex Pontificum aut "S. R. C. decretis tum ex communi Ritualistarum con- "sensu; tum etiam aliunde colligi potest, idque sæpissime "certo, aliquando tamen probabiliter tantum, aut solum "sub dubio, prout et saepe fit in re Theologicâ".[1]

21. Some would except all those rubrics, of which the matter is so minute and trifling as not to be fit matter for a precept. The opinion of certain authors, cited by Merati,[2] would favour this exception. Such rubrics, no doubt, ought to be excepted, if they can be pointed out. But it would be difficult, not to say impossible, to point out any such rubrics. The words of the decree above cited[3] —*etiam in minimis*—go to prove that there are no such rubrics. However minute the thing may be, there may be still good reason to make it matter of precept.[4]

22. It is to be remembered, however, that in the non-observance of a preceptive rubric, according to the words of Benedict XIV. just cited, not only want of advertence, but also the lightness of the matter, excuses from grievous sin; in other words, the rubric binds only *sub veniali* when the matter is of light importance. Now, when there is no scandal or contempt, any reasonable cause suffices to exempt from an obligation *sub veniali*, imposed by the ecclesiastical law; and, therefore, the non-observance of a rubric, when the matter is of light importance, is free

[1] *Explan. Rub. Miss. Rom. Introductio practica*, § 2, n. 13.

[2] Pars iii. tit. xi. n. 1. *Tertia sententia.*

[3] Supra n. 18.

[4] Cfr. Falise *Cours Abrégé de Liturgie Pratique, Introduction*, pag. 5.

from sin as often as there would be any notable inconvenience in observing it.[1]

23. On the other hand, grievous sin might be committed by a number of transgressions or omissions against the rubrics in matters which, separately, would be of light importance, but taken together are enough to constitute the matter of grievous sin.[2]

24. When the meaning of a rubric is doubtful or obscure, and also in cases for which no provision is made in the rubric, there are three authorities to which recourse may be had for our guidance. These are—1° The decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites; 2° Custom; 3° The opinions of Rubricists or Commentators on the Rubrics.

§ III. DECREES OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES.

25. The authority and the functions of this congregation are clearly set forth in the bull of Sixtus V., *Immensa æterni Dei*,[3] by which it was instituted along with many other congregations. The words of the bull which regard the Congregation of Rites are: "Quinque itidem "Cardinales delegimus, quibus haec praecipua cura incum- "bere debeat, ut veteres ritus sacri ubivis locorum, in om- "nibus Urbis, Orbisque Ecclesiis, etiam in capella nostra "Pontificia, in Missis, divinis officiis, sacramentorum ad- "ministratione, caeterisque ad cultum pertinentibus, a qui- "busvis personis diligenter observentur, caeremoniae si ex- "oleverint restitutantur, si depravatae fuerint reformentur"[4].

[1] Cfr. St. Lig. lib. v. 170 et 173; lib. vi., n. 285 in fine, et n. 347 in fine.

[2] De Herdt., par°. 6. n. 1, in fine, Cfr. St. Lig., lib. vi., n. 400.

[3] 11. Kalen. Feb., 1587. Bullarium Romanum. Edit. Car. Coquelenes, Roma, 1747.

[4] § *Congregatio Vta.* n. 1.

26. It might be justly inferred from these words that the decrees of the Sacred Congregation are to be regarded as having the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. But all doubt on the point is removed by the following answer, formally approved by the present Pope:—"An decreta a "Sacra Congregatione emanata, et responsiones quæcun- "que ab ipsa propositis dubiis scripto formiter editæ, ean- "dem habent auctoritatem, ac si immediate ab ipso summo "Pontifice promanarent, quamvis nulla facta fuerit de "iisdem relatio Sanctitati Suæ? Resp. *Affirmative*".[1] Another answer of the Sacred Congregation[2] explains the meaning of the words "*scripto formiter editæ*". It declares that all decrees and responses are to be regarded as "scripto formiter editæ", that are signed by the Prefect and Secretary of the Sac. Cong., and also that all those in the collection of Gardellini are to be regarded as such.

27. The Sacred Congregation, then, in the words of Cavalieri,[3] "pollet facultate per Sedem Apostolicam Sibi "factâ interpretandi et declarandi concessiones Pontificias, "Rubricas et quæcunque Decreta ac dubia, quæ circa "ecclesiasticos ritus, cæremonias, ac divina officia insur- "gant, et circa eadem disponendi prout circumstantiæ et "temporum et congruentiarum varietas exposcunt".

28. It is to be observed that, under the general name of "Decreta Sac. Cong.", we are to understand as included not only decrees strictly so called, but also the resolutions, declarations, or responses of any kind that ema-

[1] Die 23 Maii 1846. *Ord. Prædicat*, ad. 7; and this answer was confirmed and approved by His Holiness on the 17th July following, n. 5051.

[2] 8 April, 1854, *Romana*, n. 5202.

[3] Tom. i. cap. vi. Decr. 3. n. 12.

nate from the Sacred Congregation. This is evident from the collection of Gardellini which is entitled, "Decreta Authentica Congregationis Sacrorum Rituum", though it contains many that are not decrees in the strict sense.

29. The decrees of the Sacred Congregation, considered as to their form, are of two kinds. Some are general, addressed to the whole Church, as *e. g.* those in the beginning of the Missal and Breviary. Others, and by far the greater number, are in the form of answers to individuals or to particular churches, and even take their names, or the titles by which they are cited, from these churches, as *e. g. in Mechlinensi, in Baltimorensi*,[1] etc. But though they are thus, in form, particular, they are nearly all, in substance and intent, general and applicable everywhere throughout the Church. *Nearly all*, we say, for we must except those that imply a dispensation or privilege, or are given on account of special local circumstances.

30. We cannot do better than give here the words of Cavalieri, which express the common opinion on this subject:—"Habent Sac. Rit. Cong. Decreta ut, licet ad "particularium personarum instantias aut quaesita emanata "ea sint, ad normam et exemplum pro iisdem et aliis "similibus casibus in Ecclesiâ universali deserviant, nisi "peculiaris adsit ratio vel inspecta sit aut circumstantia, "quae Decreta penitus particularizet, et ultra personas vel "ecclesias pro quibus emanarunt, protendi ea non sinat. "Talis est se in sacris ritibus dirigendi praxis omnium "ecclesiarum. Talis est sensus omnium Doctorum qui de

[1] Gardellini *passim*.

"sacris ritibus vel cæremoniis scripsere; et si talis non foret "procedendi ratio, vel nulla vel nimis inconstans ac varia "eorundem sacrorum rituum, ac cæremoniarum extaret "norma ac regula, cum fere omnia eorundem directiva "Decreta ad instantiam particularium personarum sint "emanata, et admodum perpauca sint Decreta generalia".[1]

31. Some decrees are simply declaratory of the sense of the rubric. These bind as the rubrics themselves bind, —being preceptive when the rubric is preceptive, and directive when the rubric is directive.[2]

32. Others are not purely declaratory of the sense, but prescribe what is only obscurely implied in the rubric or remotely deduced from it, or, perhaps, something for which the rubric makes no provision at all. Decrees of this kind are admitted by all to be preceptive when they are rigorously *decrees*, or whenever they have appended to them the clause "*servetur*", "*servari mandavit*", or the like. But when they are merely answers to doubts proposed, and are issued without any such clause, Merati[3] teaches, that though they are to be received with great respect, and to be preferred to any contrary opinion of authors, they are still to be regarded as only directive. St. Liguori[4] seems to adopt this opinion of Merati, and it is the opinion followed by De Herdt.[5] Some, however, maintain that all, even those that have no such clause, are preceptive.[6]

33. It is evident that the determination of the point

[1] Tom. i. cap vi. *Decr.* 8. n. 4. Cfr. Fornici, *Notiones prævicæ*, pag. 4. De Herdt, pars i. n. 3. ii. Gardellini *in Instruct. Clement.* § 12. n 4.

[2] De Herdt. l. c. iii.

[3] Pars iii., tit. xi., n. iii.

[4] Lib. vi. n. 401.

[5] Loc. cit.

[6] Cfr. Falise, *Introduction*, § ii.

depends altogether on the *intention* of the Sacred Congregation; for, according to what has been already stated,[1] there can be no doubt about its *power*. There are good reasons in favour of the opinion that the Sacred Congregation *has* the intention of making its decrees preceptive, even when it does not use the clause "*servari mandavit*", or the like, but the authority above cited is enough to make the other opinion probable.

34. The decrees of the Sacred Congregation, like other laws, to be binding, must be sufficiently promulgated. Those that are merely declaratory are sufficiently promulgated in the rubric itself, and require only to be known as authentic.[2]

Those that prescribe anything new must be promulgated in the usual way.[3] The general decrees are published at Rome; the others are published in the particular churches to which they are addressed.

35. It is a disputed question whether decrees of this kind, addressed to particular churches, but of general application in the sense before explained,[4] are to be regarded as binding elsewhere, even though they be not solemnly promulgated to the entire Church. St. Liguori seems inclined to the opinion that they are not;[5] but he afterwards modifies this opinion by adding, that when such decrees are universally known, and are thus, in fact, promulgated by long usage and the constant reference of authors to them, they are binding on all.[6] Now, most of

[1] Sup. n. 26, 27.
[2] Cfr. St. Lig., lib. i., n. 200, *His positis*. [3] St. Lig., l. c.
[4] Sup. n. 29, 30. [5] Lib. i., n. 106, Quær. 2. *Secunda Sententia*.
[6] *Elenchus Quæstionum recentius reformatarum*, *Quæst.* ii., et in nota, l. c. Edit. Mechlin, 1845.

the decrees of the Congregation of Rites, and especially those of general application, may be truly said to be promulgated in this way since the publication of the "Decreta Authentica Cong. Sac. Rit." by Gardellini.[1]

36. It is highly probable, therefore, that such decrees, though addressed to particular churches, are, at the present day, sufficiently promulgated to be binding. But even if they do not, in strictness, bind through defect of sufficient promulgation, it is at least highly laudable to observe them when there is no doubt about their authenticity.[2]

37. We may here observe that the decrees cited in the course of this work, and in the appendix are, unless when the contrary is expressed, taken from the third edition of Gardellini.[3] Certain decrees which, in the preceding editions, were published as supplementary to some of the volumes, are, in this edition, given and numbered in their proper places according to their dates. The numbers consequently in this edition, are not the same as in the preceding editions; but this can cause no great inconvenience, as the titles and dates of the decrees are still the same. Even the numbers will be found generally to correspond, if from any proposed number in this third edition there be taken 146 or 149, the number of decrees previously published as supplementary There can be no doubt about the authenticity of a decree given in this "Collection", for it has the requisite approval of the Sacred Congregation and the Sovereign Pontiff.

[1] Vid. sup., n. 26.

[2] Cfr. Bouix, *De Jure Liturg.*, pars ii., sect. ii., cap. vi.—*Scholium.*

[3] Romae, Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, MDCCCLVI.

38. Gardellini has appended notes to several of the decrees. These notes have no public authority, but they derive great weight from the character and position of the writer, who was Assessor of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. His continuators also have appended valuable notes to some of the decrees issued since his time, that is, since May, 1826, the date of the latest decree given by Gardellini himself.

39. The most important of these decrees have been arranged in alphabetical order by Falise, the learned author of "*Cours Abrégé de Liturgie Pratique*", and published in a small volume, which has already gone through several editions. The missionary priest will find it a very useful book.

40. It has been decided that decrees of the Sacred Congregation have the effect of derogating from any, even immemorial, usage to the contrary; but in any particular case recourse may be had to the Sacred Congregation for a toleration of the usage.[1]

41. With respect to certain decrees which appear to be opposed to each other, Gardellini observes, in his preface, that the contradiction will be found, on a careful consideration of all the circumstances, to be in most of them only apparent; what is granted in one set of circumstances, *e.g.*, being refused in another, etc. But there are a few instances in which the Sacred Congregation has really changed or modified previous decrees, and in such cases we are to be guided by the latest issued on the subject.[2]

[1] 11 Sept., 1847. *In Angelop.* ad. 16., n. 5102.

[2] Cfr. Decr., 22 Apr. 1741, n. 4110, *et Annot.* n. 4542, ad 4, 27 Sept. 1817.

§ IV. CUSTOM.

42. The Rubrics, if we except a few which regard the matter and form of the Sacraments, are ecclesiastical laws, and, like other ecclesiastical laws, are affected by "custom".

43. We must here suppose the general principles regarding custom laid down by theologians and canonists in the treatise "*De Legibus*". Custom may be in strict accordance with the law, *secundum legem;* or it may be beside, or go beyond, the law, *præter legem;* or it may be at variance with the law, *contra legem.*[1]

44. Custom, which is in accordance with the law, that is, in the present matter, with the rubric, is the best interpreter of the rubric, according to the well known axiom, "*optima est legum interpres consuetudo*".[2] The actual practice of those who know the law, and who *bona fide* intend, in what they do, to fulfil the law, is a very good evidence of the sense in which the legislator wished his law to be understood.

45. When, therefore, the meaning of a rubric is doubtful, the actual practice of Rome is an excellent means of determining that meaning. The clergy there know the law and intend to carry it out in their practice; and moreover, their practice is under the very eye of the supreme authority. The usage of Rome is, therefore, justly regarded as decisive in the matter of sacred rites. So it was regarded by Benedict XIV., who, when Archbishop of Bologna, condemned a certain practice in that city on the

[1] Suarez, *De Legibus*, Lib. vii. cap. iv.

[2] *l. Si de interpretatione ff. de Legib.*, apud Reiffenstuel, Tom. i. lib. i. Decret. tit. iv. n. 8,

ground that it was opposed to the usage of Rome, which, he says, "Sacrorum Rituum magistra merito appellatur".[1]

46. Custom, which goes beyond the rubric, "*præter legem*", *i. e.* which requires something not contained or implied in the rubric, but yet not at variance with it, may have all the conditions necessary to make its observance licit or even obligatory.

47. It is a matter of little moment whether we are to regard custom with these conditions as sufficient of itself to induce an obligation, or as merely the evidence of an unwritten law from which it has its origin. The former is the opinion of Suarez,[2] and is the one commonly received. The latter is the opinion of Cardenas,[3] which is developed and maintained at great length by the *Melanges Theologiques*.[4]

48. Whatever be the source of the obligation, it is certain, at all events, that "custom" has sometimes the force of law; and that this is the case in ceremonies as well as in other matters, appears from certain decrees of the Sacred Congregation,[5] and might be inferred from the words of the rubric regarding local usages in the marriage ceremony.

49. These two kinds of custom present little difficulty in the matter of ceremonies. The chief difficulty is in determining how far custom, of the third kind, "*contra legem*", can justify a departure from the rubrics, or how

[1] *Instit.* xxx. n. 23. [2] *De Legibus*, Lib. vii., cap. 14, et seq.

[3] *Crisis Theol.* tract iii. *de Legibus et Præceptis*, disp. xxiii. cap. v. art. v. vi. et viii.

[4] 2me Serie, Art. "*De la coutume en Rubriques*", pag. 208 et seq.

[5] 15 Sept. 1668, *in Conversan.* n. 2448,—13 Jul., 1675, *in Aquil.* n. 2736.

far any existing custom at variance with the rubrics can be licitly retained.

50. There can be little doubt that custom, with certain conditions, can abrogate any human law. "Nihil "magis tritum", says Benedict XIV.[1] "quam legem quam- "libet humanam, etiam canonicam, posse contrariâ con- "suetudine quæ sit rationabilis et legitime præscripta, "abrogari, juxta textum in cap. final. *de Consuetudine*".

51. The conditions required are expressed in the words "*rationabilis et legitime præscripta*", which are the words of the text referred to, taken from the decretal of Gregory IX. But all are not agreed as to what precisely must be understood as included under these words. Benedict XIV. in another place in the same work,[2] explains them thus. Having stated that custom may abolish a law, he adds that for this it must have certain conditions:— "Et primo quidem ut sit rationabilis, hoc est, neque juri "divino, neque naturali contraria nec expresse a jure "reprobata, aut in legislatoris contemptum invecta: "deinde ut a majori communitatis parte libere et sponte "sit inducta, pluribusque ac continuis actibus frequen- "tata animo legem tollendi: ac demum ut adsit con- "sensus legislatoris non quidem expressus et *personalis*, "qualem cum aliis necessarium voluit Pontius, lib. 6 de "Matrim., cap. 6, n. 7, sed consensus legalis et juridicus, "qui nimirum jam habetur per leges et canones omnem "consuetudinem populi moribus inductam approbantes, "eique vires tribuentes abrogandi legem: quod commu- "nissime sentiunt doctores congesti a Suarez. cit. lib. 7, "cap. 18, num. 14". These words, taken in connection

[1] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. xii. cap. viii. n. 8. [2] Lib. xiii. cap. v. n. 5.

with the preceding extract, show that, to be "legitime præscripta", according to Benedict XIV., the custom must prevail amongst the greater part of the community with the intention of abrogating the law, and must also have (at least constructively) the consent of the legislator.

52. The chief point, after all, in this matter is, to ascertain whether the custom opposed to any law has the sanction of the legislator; because, as the same great authority states, "Quod consuetudo prævaleat contra legem superioris, id oritur ex ipsomet superioris consensu qui eam etiam suæ legi obviantem, cum rationabilis et diuturna est, statuit tolerandam".[1] It is then justly observed by Falise,[2] that all the other conditions laid down and discussed by theologians and canonists are no more than the preamble, as it were, to that consent of the legislator, whether express or by legal construction, from which, and from which alone, custom derives its efficacy.

53. From all this, then, it is evident that no custom, however widespread or long-continued, can be allowed to prevail against the rubric, unless so far as the legislator, that is, the Sovereign Pontiff, by himself, or by the Congregation of Rites as his organ,[3] consents to, or tolerates that custom.

54. The whole inquiry is thus practically reduced to the simple question of fact, viz.: In what, and how far does the Holy See consent to any existing custom at variance with the rubrics?

To answer this question satisfactorily, it is necessary to say a word on each of the liturgical books separately.

[1] Lib. xii. cap. viii. n. 8.

[2] *Introduction au Cours Abrégé de Liturgie*, § iv.

[3] Vid. supra, n. **24.**

55. And, first, with regard to the missal. The bull of St. Pius V., *Quo primum*,[1] given at the commencement of the missal, prohibits the use of any other than the missal then published, and all customs at variance with its rubrics, in all churches, "in quibus missa conventualis "alta voce cum choro, aut demissa, celebrari juxta Ro- "manæ Ecclesiae ritum consuevit vel debet"—that is to say, throughout the whole Latin Church.[2] It excepts only those churches in which a different usage had been followed for two hundred years previously. After declaring that churches in which other missals had been in use for this period, are permitted to follow the ancient usage, the bull proceeds—". . . ex aliis vero omnibus ecclesiis "præfatis eorumdem missalium usum tollendo, illaque "penitus et omnino rejiciendo, ac huic missali nostro "nuper edito, nihil unquam addendum, detrahendum aut "immutandum esse decernendo, sub indignationis nostræ "pœna, hac nostra perpetua valitura constitutione statui- "mus et ordinamus. Mandantes, ac districte omnibus et "singulis . . . . illis in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ "præcipientes ut, cæteris omnibus rationibus et ritibus "ex aliis missalibus quantumvis vetustis hactenus obser- "vari consuetis in posterum penitus omissis, ac plane "rejectis, missam juxta ritum, modum, ac normam quæ "per missale hoc a Nobis nunc traditur, decantent ac "legant", etc., etc.

56. It appears, therefore, that a custom at variance with the rubrics of the missal, has the sanction of the Holy See, and can be licitly retained, provided it had existed for two hundred years before the date of this bull.

[1] Pridie idus Julii, 1570. [2] Vid. supra, n. 8.

It is true, this is not exactly the case of custom abolishing a law, but rather of custom in certain places preventing a general law from being extended to these places. But the effect is the same. Such a custom, where it exists, may be regarded as one at variance with the rubric, and yet having the consent of the Holy See.

57. But it is evident from the words cited, that this consent cannot be claimed for any other custom, either then existing or afterwards introduced, against the rubric of the missal. If there could be any doubt on the point, it is removed by several decrees of the Congregation of Rites, in which all such customs are declared to be abuses. Thus in the decrees printed by order of Urban VIII. at the commeneement of the missal, we have these words: "Demum renovando decreta alias facta, mandat Sacra "Congregatio in omnibus et per omnia servari Rubricas "Missalis Romani, non obstante quocunque praetextu, et "contraria consuetudine quam abusum esse declarat". Other decrees of the same import may be seen in Gardellini.[1] There is one rubric, however, which may perhaps be excepted; that, namely, which regards the purification to be administered to the laity after communion. We shall have occasion to refer to it in treating of the similar rubric given in the Ritual.

58. All that has been said regarding the missal is equally applicable to the Breviary. The bull *Quod a nobis*, printed at the commencement of the Roman Breviary, contains similar provisions, and almost in the very same words, regarding the obligation of using it except where

[1] *In Oscen*, 16 March, 1591, ad 10, n. 15,—14 June, 1845, *Ord. Discal*, n. 5018.

another had been in use for two hundred years. The decrees of the Sacred Congregation also insist in similar terms, on the strict observance of its rubrics.[1]

59. The Bull of Clement VIII., *Ex quo in Ecclesia Dei*, given at the commencement of the "Pontificale Romanum", orders in like manner (but without any exception in favour of custom, however ancient) the strict observance, by all who exercise Pontificalia, of what is there prescribed for the various functions contained in it, and prohibits any change or modification whatever.

60. With regard to the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum", the bulls printed at the commencement of it are no less clear and decisive as to the strict obligation of following what it prescribes. To show that no custom can be allowed to prevail against it, it is enough to cite the following words of a decree of the Sacred Congregation, dated so recently as 12 Dec., 1832.[2] "Cæremonialis Episcoporum legem a summis Pontificibus Clemente VIII., "Innocentio X., et Benedicto XIV., latam et confirmatam, "hujusmodi indolis esse, ut a nulla contraria consuetudine "abrogari valeat, accedentibus præsertim non paucis "S.R.C. decretis".

61. It had been declared in previous decrees,[3] that the "Cæremoniale" does not do away with laudable immemorial customs. If by "laudable customs" we can understand any that are opposed to the Cæremoniale, and not simply those that are in accordance with it, or at least reconcilable

[1] 16 March, 1658, *in Jacen*, n. 1868,—17 Nov. 1674, *in Veronen*, n. 2719,—28 Sept. 1675, *in Compostell.* ad 5, n. 2749.

[2] *In Pisana*, n. 4696.

[3] 11 Jun. 1605 *in Hispan.* n. 266—17 Jun. 1606 *in Elbor.* n. 318.

with it, they must be in the strictest sense *immemorial*, otherwise their observance is not lawful.[1]

62. And now we come to consider the question of custom as it affects what is prescribed by the Roman Ritual. It is not easy, it must be confessed, to determine how far the consent or toleration of the Holy See is extended to customs at variance with the rubrics of the Ritual.

63. The bull of Paul V., *Apostolicæ sedi*, printed at the commencement of the Ritual, is as follows: "Apos-"tolicæ Sedi per abundantiam divinæ gratiæ, nullis "suffragantibus meritis, præpositi, Nostræ sollicitudinis "esse intelligimus, super universam Domum Dei ita in-"vigilando intendere, ut opportunis in dies magis ration-i-"bus provideatur, quo, sicut admonet Apostolus, omnia in "ea honeste, et secundum ordinem fiant, præcipue vero "quæ pertinent ad Ecclesiæ Dei Sacramentorum admi-"nistrationem, in qua religiose observari Apostolicis tradi-"tionibus, et SS. Patrum Decretis constitutos Ritus et "Cæremonias pro Nostri officii debito curare omnino tene-"mur. Quamobrem fel. rec. Pius Papa V. Praedecessor "noster, hujus Nostri tunc Sui officii memor, ad restituen-"dam sacrorum Rituum observationem in sacrosancto "Missae Sacrificio, divinoque Officio, et simul ut Catholica "Ecclesia in Fidei unitate, ac sub uno visibili capite B. "Petri successore Romano Pontifice congregata, unum "psallendi et orandi ordinem, quantum cum Domino "poterit, teneret, Breviarium primùm, et deinde Missale "Romanum, multo studio et diligentia elaborata pastorali "providentia edenda censuit. Cujus vestigia eodem sapi-

[1] Vid Bouix, *De Jure Liturg.* pars. iv. cap. 3, § iv.

" entiæ spiritu secutus similis memoriæ Clemens Papa
" VIII. etiam Prædecessor Noster, non solum Episcopis, et
" inferioribus Ecclesiæ Prælatis accurate restitutum Pon-
" tificale dedit, sed etiam complures alias in Cathedralibus
" et inferioribus Ecclesiis cæremonias promulgato Cære-
" moniali ordinavit. His ita constitutis, restabat, ut uno
" etiam volumine comprehensi, sacri et sinceri Catholicæ
" Ecclesiæ Ritus, qui in Sacramentorum administratione,
" aliisque Ecclesiasticis functionibus servari debent, ab iis,
" qui curam animarum gerunt, Apostolicæ Sedis auctori-
" tate prodirent, ad cujus voluminis præscriptum, in tanta
" Ritualium multitudine, sua illi ministeria tamquam ad
" publicam et obsignatam normam peragerent, unoque ac
" fideli ductu inoffenso pede ambularent cum consensu.
" Quod quidem jampridem agitatum negotium, postquam
" Generalium Conciliorum græce latineque divina gratia
" editorum opus morari desivit, sollicite urgere Nostri
" muneris esse existimavimus. Ut autem recte, et ordine,
" ut par erat, res ageretur, nonnullis ex Venerabilibus Fra-
" tribus nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus, pietate, doctrina et
" prudentia præstantibus, eam demandavimus, qui cum
" consilio eruditorum virorum, variisque præsertim anti-
" quis et quæ circumferuntur, Ritualibus consultis, eoque
" in primis, quod vir singulari pietatis zelo, et doctrina
" bonæ memoriæ Julius Antonius S. R. E. Cardinalis S.
" Severinæ nuncupatus, longo studio, multaque industria
" et labore plenissimum composuerat, rebusque omnibus
" mature consideratis, demum divina aspirante clementia,
" quanta oportuit brevitate, Rituale confecerunt. In quo
" cum receptos et approbatos Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Ritus
" suo ordine digestos conspexerimus, illud sub nomine

"Ritualis Romani merito edendum publico Ecclesiæ Dei "bono judicavimus. Quapropter hortamur in Domino "Venerabiles Fratres Patriarchas, Archiepiscopos, et Epis- "copos, et dilectos Filios eorum Vicarios, necnon Abbates, "Parochos universos, ubique locorum existentes, et alios, "ad quos spectat, ut in posterum tamquam Ecclesiæ, "Romanæ filii, ejusdem Ecclesiæ omnium matris et "magistræ auctoritate constituto Rituali in sacris func- "tionibus utantur, et in re tanti momenti, quæ Catholica "Ecclesia, et ab ea probatus usus antiquitatis statuit, "inviolate observent.

"Datum Romæ apud S. Mariam Majorem, sub Annulo "Piscatoris, die xvii. Junii MDCXIV. Pontificatus Nostri "anno X.

"*S. Cobellutius*".

64. Now, it must be evident that the use of the Roman Ritual, to the exclusion of every other, is not here insisted on in terms like those of the bull *Quo primum* above cited[1] regarding the use of the Missal, or the similar terms employed regarding the use of the Breviary, Pontifical and Cæremoniale. Instead of *mandantes . . . in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ præcipientes, etc., etc.*, we have here merely . . . . *hortamur in Domino* . . . ut in posterum . . . . utantur, etc. . . . . Accordingly, some theologians have maintained that the use of the Roman Ritual, though earnestly recommended, is not of precept, that whatever it contains of precept is of precept *aliunde*, and that the rest is prescribed only *de decentiâ*. This opinion is cited by St. Liguori without disapproval.[2] Catalani, while he extols the authority of

[1] Supra, n. 55. [2] Lib. vi., n. 285, *Dub.* 4.

the Roman Ritual, holds, nevertheless, that particular churches may use their own ritual. . . . "modo ritus lauda-"biles sint ac probati, nihilque contineant quod Christianæ "doctrinæ, bonisque moribus adversetur.[1]

According to De Herdt,[2] the Church has approved of the Roman Ritual, and wishes to have it used every where, but does not impose it as of precept. He infers this, (*a*) from the words of the bull, which merely exhort, but do not command; (*b*) from a decree of the Sacred Congregation, in which, in reply to the Archbishop of Manilla, it expresses only a desire "*placere sibi*" that the observance of the Roman Ritual be introduced if it had not been so already;[3] and (*c*) from the notorious fact that other rituals, or, as they are sometimes called, pastorals, are used in some places with the knowledge, and with at least the toleration, of the Holy See. He cites a decree of the third synod of Mechlin, *approved by the Holy See*, in which it is ordered that "In administrandis sacra-"mentis pastorale suæ Ecclesiæ cathedralis omnes se-"quantur, et eo deficiente, ecclesiæ metropolitani, nihil "temere addendo, demendo, vel immutando". This decree, however, is of little weight, because the synod was held in 1608, six years before the publication of the Roman Ritual.[4]

65. On the other hand, there are good reasons for holding that the use of the Roman Ritual is obligatory every where throughout the Latin Church. The words of the bull, it is true, do not formally convey a precept,

[1] *Præf. ad Lectorem, no.* xi. [2] Par. vi., n. 1.
[3] 2 Mail, 1626, *in Manilien*, n. 629.
[4] Cfr. Melanges Theologiques, vime serie, pag. 340.

but, on careful examination, it will be seen that they suppose or imply one. The Pontiff, commences by declaring that he is strictly bound by his office to take care that, in the administration of the sacraments, the rites and ceremonies established by apostolic tradition and the decrees of the fathers be religiously observed; . . . . that, as his predecessors had published the Breviary, Missal, Pontifical, and Ceremonial, it remained only to have published, by the authority of the Holy See, a Ritual, according to which, as a public and authorized standard, amidst such a multitude of rituals, those who have care of souls should perform their sacred functions. Having stated what means were taken to prepare it, he proceeds to say, that seeing it to contain the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, he publishes it under the title of the Roman Ritual for the public good of the Church of God. *In quo cum receptos et approbatos Catholicæ Ecclesiæ ritus suo ordine digestos conspexerimus, illud sub nomine Ritualis Romani merito edendum publico Ecclesiæ Dei bono judicavimus.* Wherefore he exhorts all . . . for the future, as children of the Roman Church, to use in their sacred functions the ritual established by the authority of the same church, the mother and mistress of all, etc. *Quapropter hortamur in Domino, etc.*, as above.[1]

Now the canon of the Council of Trent, previously cited,[2] declares that, in the solemn administration of the sacraments, there is a strict obligation of observing the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, and the bull here expressly affirms that those rites are contained in the Roman Ritual. Whence it plainly

[1] Supra, n. 63.

[2] Supra, n. 16.

follows that, in the administration of the sacraments, there is a strict obligation of observing what is prescribed in that Ritual. It is true that, in this matter, a certain latitude ought, perhaps, to be admitted. It may be contended that rites differing from each other in some details could, nevertheless, all be "recepti et approbati" in the sense of the canon. But there is no sufficient security that those contained in any ritual published without the sanction of the Roman Pontiff are "recepti et approbati".[1]

To make the use of the Roman ritual preceptive, then, at least as far as the administration of the sacraments is concerned, the Pontiff may have judged it sufficient to declare that it contains the "receptos et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus", the canon of Trent having already defined that there is an obligation of observing these.

66. This interpretation is confirmed by the consideration, that one declared object of the Pontiff is to secure uniformity in the administration of the sacraments and other ecclesiastical functions by fixing one amongst the various rituals then in use, as a standard to which all should conform. Such an object could hardly be attained, or could be attained only very imperfectly, unless the standard ritual were made obligatory every where. From the word *ubique* in the first paragraph of the rubrics above cited,[2] Baruffaldi[3] infers the intention of the Church to secure uniformity by making the Roman Ritual obligatory every where. In another part of his commentary also[4] he urges the same reason, and insists on

[1] Vid. supra, n. 17.
[2] Supra, n. 16.
[3] Tit. ii. n. 9.
[4] Tit. ii. n. 84 et seq.

ligation of pastors to use the Roman Ritual and
ır.

According to this view, the "*hortamur in*
)" is to be understood, not as a mere counsel,
an earnest exhortation to do what had just been
ntly declared to be of strict obligation.[1]

We have before cited[2] the decree of Benedict
in which bishops are strictly ordered to prohibit,
labour zealously to remove as a detestable abuse,
er they may find opposed to the Rubrics of the

This decree, whose authority, as has been said,[3] is
greatest weight, appears to leave no doubt that
a strict obligation of using the Roman Ritual
here except in those churches which are excepted
lecree itself, viz., those in which the Holy See has
ned the use of a different ritual.

Since the time of Benedict XIII., the Congrega-
f Rites has issued several decrees which clearly
convey the same thing. Thus it has frequently
ed: "Servetur Rituale Romanum"; "Juxta Rituale
anum"; "Juxta Ritualis Romani Rubricam";[4]
soli libri adhibendi, et in illis tantum benedic-
ous, quæ Rituali Romano sunt conformes".[5]

in, amongst the decrees regarding prohibited books
beginning of the index, we have "§ IV. 1, Benedic-
s omnes ecclesiasticæ, nisi approbatæ fuerint a Sac.
Cong. 7 Rituali Romano additiones omnes factæ

[1] Clericati *de Extrema Unctione*, Decis. 66, n. 19 et seq.
[2] , n. 18. [3] Loc. cit.
[4] c., 1742, *Nullius Fasani.* n. 4133;—23 Maii, 1835, *Ord. Min.*
ad. 1;—12 Mart. 1836, *in Trident.* n. 4777, ad 13.
[5] pril, 183?, *in Ariminen.* n. 4681, ad 5.

"aut faciendæ post reformationem Pauli V. sine approba-
"tione S R. C."[1]

70. It would be impossible, we think, to reconcile these declarations and decrees with the supposition that custom, or episcopal authority in any diocese, is enough to justify a departure from the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual, or to justify the use of any other ritual at variance with it.

71. But all doubt on this point would appear to be removed by certain recent answers of the Sacred Congregation—one to the Bishop of Troyes, cited by the "Melanges Theologiques",[2] which declares that the laws of the Roman Ritual affect the whole Church. "Rituale Romanum", it says in referring to it, "cujus leges universam afficiunt Ecclesiam"; another to the Curè of Bar-sur-Aube, declaring that he may use the Roman Ritual, notwithstanding the prohibition of his bishop;[3] and another to a canon of Mans,[4] in which it is declared that the canons or other priests of the diocese could not, with a safe conscience, infringe or neglect the preceptive rules of the Roman Ritual, nor would the authority of the bishop be sufficient to justify them in doing so.

72. We conclude, therefore, that, although on account of the reasons and authorities above stated,[5] it cannot be

[1] Vid. "*Index Librorum Prohibitorum*", in "*Dictionnaire des Heresies*", Migne, Paris, 1858, pag. 935.

[2] VI^me^ *Serie* 3^me^ Cahier, p. 339.

[3] 22 Mai 1841, *in Trecen.* given by Falise in the *Alphabetical Compendium* (vid. supra n. 39), *V. Rituale Romanum*, and referred there to no. 4779 in Gardellini, though we could not find it in our copy of Gardellini. (Editio tertia, Roma, MDCCCLVI.).

[4] 10 Jan. 1852, *in Cenomanen.* n. 5165, ad 4.

[5] Supra, n. 64.

said to be perfectly certain, it is at least far the more probable opinion, that the Roman Ritual is obligatory everywhere throughout the Latin Church, and that the Holy See alone can authorize any change or modification in what it prescribes. Whatever doubt there may be as to the obligation imposed by the bull of Paul V., there can hardly be a reasonable doubt as to the obligation expressed or implied in the subsequent decrees and declarations above cited.

73. To the argument from the sanction or toleration of a different ritual in some places, it may be answered: 1° The approval by the Holy See of a different ritual in a particular place, serves only to confirm the general obligation (which is all we contend for) of using the Roman, according to the principle "exceptio firmat regulam". The decree of Benedict XIII. above cited,[1] expressly refers to such exceptions. 2° Some of these rituals differ from the Roman only by the addition of certain customary ceremonies in themselves laudable, such, *e. g.* as the rubric of the Roman Ritual itself expressly wishes to have observed in the celebration of marriage. The Ritual published for the use of the English clergy,[2] may perhaps be taken as an example. Others differ from it only by the omission or abbreviation of certain ceremonies authorized by special indult or dispensation from the Holy See, as *e. g.* the ritual published for the use of the clergy in the United States.[3] 3° The toleration

[1] Sup., n. 18.

[2] *Ordo administrandi Sacramenta*, etc. . . . *ex Rituali Romano* . . . *nonnullis adjectis ex Antiquo Rituali Anglicano.* Derbiæ, Richardson, 1856.

[3] *Excerpta ex Rituali Romano*, etc.—Baltimori, 1860.

extended to certain rituals published by episcopal authority and differing considerably from the Roman, proves nothing but the forbearance of the Holy See. While it declares on every convenient opportunity, the obligation of the Roman Ritual, it does not enforce the obligation by severe penalties. That is all. And there may be good reasons for this forbearance. It may be that in some places the observance of the Roman Ritual would interfere with long established customs, which the people are attached to, and would not willingly give up, and that it is less evil to tolerate such customs than to run the risk of suddenly interfering with them. But the obligation of the Roman Ritual, though suspended, so to speak, by the circumstances, still exists, and requires that at least some effort be made to prepare the way for its introduction. And here we may, not improbably, find a reason why the bull of Paul V. concludes, as it does, by earnestly exhorting, instead of commanding, etc. There was a great variety of rituals then in use, as the bull itself states; and there was consequently a great variety of usages in different parts of the Church. Perhaps the Pontiff—knowing the great difficulties there might be in some places in conforming at once to the Roman Ritual, and abolishing customs of long standing—judged it expedient to adopt the form he did adopt; that is, to state reasons from which not only the importance, but the strict obligation, of following the Roman Ritual might be apparent, and yet to urge its actual observance only on such terms as would leave the bishops and pastors considerable latitude in respect to the time and circumstances in which they would introduce it. The decree of the

Sacred Congregation, referred to by De Herdt,[1] is in perfect accordance with this supposition. The Sacred Congregation contents itself at that time—hardly twelve years after the publication of the Ritual—with expressing a desire, but does not yet think it expedient to insist, as it might, that, in the case proposed, the Roman Ritual should be observed. The tone of subsequent decrees, as we have seen, is very different.

74. In all this discussion we have considered the obligation of the Roman Ritual only as it regards the administration of the sacraments. The bull declares that it contains the received and approved rites of the Church, and as the Council of Trent has defined that, in the solemn administration of the sacraments, these rites cannot be omitted "pro libito" without sin, it evidently follows that the priest, in such adminstration, is bound to comply with the rubrics of the Roman Ritual. But if another ritual be approved of by the Holy See for a particular place, it may, of course, be followed in that place, because any change or omission, being duly authorized, would not then be "pro libito".

75. It is to be observed, however, that the arguments adduced, except the one from the Canon of Trent, apply not only to the rubrics that regard the administration of the sacraments, but to those that regard the other ecclesiastical functions as well. Thus, the bull itself having stated what had been done for the other liturgical books, says: ". . . restabat ut, uno etiam volumine comprehensi, sacri "et sinceri Catholicæ Ecclesiæ ritus, qui in sacramento- "rum administratione, *aliisque ecclesiasticis functionibus*

[1] 2 Maii, 1626—Vid. supra, n. 64.

"servari debent ab iis qui curam animarum gerunt, Apos-
"tolicæ sedis auctoritate prodirent", etc.; and concludes by urging the use of the ritual then published, not merely in the administration of the sacraments, but *in sacris functionibus*, which must be understood as comprehending all the ecclesiastical functions contained in the Ritual.

The decree of Benedict XIII. also applies to the other functions as well as to the administration of the sacraments, as is evident from the words;[1] and the same may be said of the decrees of the Sacred Congregation,[2] some of which regard, not the administration of the sacraments, but other functions.

76. Supposing, then, this general obligation of the Roman Ritual, we come at length to the question: how far the consent of the Holy See has been given to any custom at variance with what the Roman Ritual prescribes.[3] The answer may be collected from what has been said. 1° That consent is expressly given to the laudable customs observed in particular places in the celebration of marriage. The ceremony of marriage as given in the Roman Ritual is very short and simple, and such customs being additions to it, may, perhaps, be regarded as at variance with the rubric;[4] though in strictness they are rather to be looked on as in accordance with it, since the rubric itself expresses a wish that they be observed. 2° The rituals approved of by the Holy See for use in particular places, such, *e.g.*, as the rituals referred to parenthetically in the decree of Benedict XIII.,[5] differ

[1] Supra, n. 18. [2] Supra, n. 69. [3] Vid. supra, n. 54.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 69, in fine. [5] Supra, n. 18.

from the Roman, chiefly by embodying in their rubrics certain customs peculiar to those places. The approval, therefore, of such rituals may be regarded as giving consent to the customs which they contain.

77. But we doubt if the consent of the Holy See can be claimed for any other customs that could be looked on as in any way at variance with the rubric of the Roman Ritual. *Consent*, we say, because there may be, and there have been often, granted indults or dispensations in virtue of which such customs are allowed to be continued for a time; but, of course, as soon as the indult ceases, the rubric or law of the ritual revives with all its force.

78. We have still, however, to consider whether custom, though it may want that consent which is necessary to make it prevail against the rubric, does not, mediately and indirectly, justify the neglect of what the rubric prescribes, by making it very difficult, or morally impossible, to observe it. This is a question of the greatest importance as regards Ireland, and countries similarly circumstanced.

79. In Ireland the Roman Ritual of Paul V. was introduced immediately after its publication. Amongst the statutes of Clonmacnoise, avowedly taken from previous synodical decrees of the province of Armagh,[1] we have the following: "7. Statuimus et ordinamus omnibus "sacerdotibus hujusce diœcesis in administratione sacra- "mentorum, solo Rituali Romano, et non alio uti". These statutes are dated Oct. 7, 1624, only ten years after the date of the bull *Apostolicæ Sedi*.[2] In the statutes of

[1] Vid. *Collections on Irish Church History from the MSS. of the V. Rev. Laurence Renehan*, by Rev. Daniel M'Carthy, p. 146 et seq.

[2] Supra, n. 63

Tuam, A.D. 1631, it is ordered that, "18. Omnes et "singuli hujus Provinciæ Tuamensis eodem Rituali "Romano Pauli Papæ V. utantur".[1] In another synod of Tuam, A.D. 1660, we find the following: "4. Decernitur "sacramenta administranda esse juxta sacros Can[s]. re- "ceptasque rubricas Ritualis Romani Pauli V., et lauda- "bilem praxim orthodoxæ ecclesiæ in Hybernia, ac "proinde hac in parte omnes abusus, præsumptiones anti- "canonicas, et corruptelas abolendas esse".[2] The "lau- "dabilis praxis" here mentioned, is probably the use of a few ceremonies taken from the old ritual of Sarum, which were generally observed throughout the country. In the Synod of Drogheda, held in February, 1614, it was ordered that, in the administration of the sacraments and other sacred functions, priests should observe strictly . . . "as far as possible, all the ceremonies "of the holy Roman Catholic Church, and at least "admitting no change from them, except those of the "Ritual of Sarum, which has been tolerated for a long "time in this province and throughout the kingdom".[3] The Sarum rites are still observed in the celebration of marriage, and one or two other sacred functions, and hence the edition of the Roman Ritual used by the Irish clergy, contains a few extracts from the Ritual of Sarum.

80. But the operation of the penal laws against the Catholic religion made it impossible to carry out many things prescribed by the rubrics. With regard to some rubrics, there was an absolute impossibility of observing

[1] *Collections, etc.* Appendix D, p. 492.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 501.
[3] *Collections, etc.*, Appendix A, p. 429.

them, inasmuch as there were no churches and very few clergy. With regard to others, the difficulty of observing them was so great, that the bishops were obliged to seek and to use extensive faculties of dispensing in them. Mass was celebrated, and baptism, with the solemn ceremonies, as well as the other sacraments, was administered in private houses; and this often under an apprehension of danger so great that, on these occasions, some of the faithful were usually posted as sentinels at convenient places, to guard against a sudden surprise and the consequent arrest, or perhaps the massacre, of all concerned.[1]

81. Again, all the clergy were educated in continental countries, and some had been employed in pastoral duties in those countries before entering on their mission in Ireland. These, in many instances, learned the use of diocesan or provincial rituals, differing from the Roman in many details, and embodying usages peculiar to the diocese or province in which they had been officiating. On coming to Ireland, they brought with them these usages, and taught them to others, and transmitted them to their successors, many of whom had no other knowledge of ceremonies than what they acquired in this way. It is easy to see that such a state of things, continued through several generations, should naturally give rise, as it did, to many omissions, and to many practices at variance with the rubrics.

82. It could not be expected that customs thus established would disappear at once with the persecution from which they sprang. The toleration granted to the

[1] Vid. *Collections, etc.*, Lives of the Primates Maguire, M'Mahon, and O'Reilly, pp. 84-103.

Catholics could affect such customs only by very slow degrees. When churches began to be erected, they were at first so few and so remote from the houses of many of the parishioners, so poor also and so badly provided with vestments and other requisites, that little or no change could yet be made. Besides, the number of clergy was very small compared with the population. Each priest was consequently charged with the care of so many souls, often scattered over an extensive district, that in administering the sacraments he was obliged, in most cases, to shorten the ceremonies—in fact, to adopt as his general rule what the rubric permits only in case of necessity, or what the Holy See permits by special faculties granted to bishops and vicars-apostolic in missionary countries. This is the reason why, in the epitome of the Roman Ritual published for the use of the Irish clergy, many important rubrics were omitted. They could not, in the circumstances of the country, be observed, and their insertion, therefore, would needlessly increase the size and expense of the volume.

83. Thank God, this state of things exists no longer. The improvement, slow at first, has been very notable and very rapid of late years. Churches have been multiplied, and the clergy very much increased in number, while a great zeal for sacred ceremonies has been manifested everywhere throughout the country, especially since the Synod of Thurles. The improvement is still going on, and we may hope that many years will not elapse until every trace of the mutilation caused by the penal laws will have disappeared from our ritual observances.

84. As yet, however, neither the churches nor the clergy are sufficiently numerous to make it possible to comply with all the rubrics of the Ritual as they are carried out in some Catholic countries. There are parishes where many of the old customs are still justified by necessity. There are others in which the same customs, though not justified by a strict necessity, are nevertheless so interwoven with the habits of the people and of the older clergy, that they could not be suddenly abolished without causing great inconvenience and great dissatisfaction. Now, in circumstances like these, it may be fairly contended, that custom, though it does not abolish the law of the rubric, suspends its obligation until the difficulties in the way of its observance are removed.

85. It is for the bishop to judge of the nature and extent of these difficulties, and to take such measures as prudence may suggest for their removal. The Sacred Congregation, consulted on a case of the kind, left the bishop to deal with it as he might judge prudent in the circumstances. This was the purport of the answer given to the Bishop of Montpellier, when there was question of a custom at variance with express decrees of the Sacred Congregation: "Pro gratia speciali, non obstantibus de-"cretis, Episcopus pro suo arbitrio et prudentia juxta "particulares casus et circumstantias indulgeat".[1] And Gardellini observes, with reference to a somewhat similar answer concerning communion at a Requiem Mass, that it is not unusual for the Sacred Congregation to act in this way, in order to avoid offence or scandal. "Novum "non est ut S. C. prudenti aliqua discretione utatur in

[1] 22 Jul., 1848, *in una Montis Politiani*, n 5130.

"iis quæ in sacris ritibus quamdam possunt aut mod
"rationem aut indulgentiam admittere, ad effectum ev
"tandi admirationem offensionemve et scandala".[1]

86. It is certain, at all events, that no priest shou undertake to change an existing custom, where suc change would involve the danger of offence, witho having previously consulted the bishop. But whe there is no such danger—where there is question simpl of the observance of rubrics that were previously slurr over or neglected—there is no reason why he may no and should not, endeavour to comply with them as exactl as circumstances permit.

87. We cannot do better than give here the words the Synod of Thurles in reference to this important ma ter: "Optaret haec Synodus ut ea omnia quæ, ob temp "rum calamitates, Ecclesiæ legibus minus conformia, pr "sertim in sacramentorum administratione, inducta sun "ad normam generalis disciplinæ quam citissime reduc "rentur; verum cum, ut ait S. Augustinus, '*quæ utilita* "*juvant, novitate quandoque perturbant*', sequentia ta "tum ad renovationem disciplinæ hac in re spectanti "monenda aut statuenda censet.

"1° Ritus omnes præscripti in Rituali Roman "Rubricis Missalis, et Pontificali Romano pro Sacr "mentorum administratione, quantum circumstanti "hujus regionis permittunt, accurate observentur etc.[2]

88. In explaining some of the rubrics, we shall hav occasion to notice a few of the difficulties that are still i

[1] *In fine annotationis* ad Dub. ix. *Panormit.*, 12 April., 1823, n. 459
[2] *De Sacramentis*, pag 16.

the way of a full compliance with what is prescribed, and to suggest means by which, in many instances at least, these difficulties might be diminished or altogether removed.

§ V. RUBRICISTS.

89. It is evident that, in explaining the meaning of any rubric, we must attach great weight to the opinions of writers who have made the rubrics a special study, or who have specially treated the questions which the particular rubric may chance to involve. The Sacred Congregation has sometimes answered a question by directing those who proposed it to consult approved writers on the rubrics. Thus, to a question regarding the genuflexions to be made in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, it concludes the answer by the words, "pro reliquis con-"sulantur Rubricistæ".[1]

90. When these writers are unanimous or nearly so, in giving a certain meaning to a rubric, or in inculcating a certain obligation as implied in a rubric, or connected with it, it may be taken as a sure sign that the rubric has that meaning, or involves that obligation. Such unanimity is, in truth, but the expression in words of the sentiment of the Church, or of that approved custom which, as has been previously stated,[2] is the best interpreter of laws. Just as the unanimous consent of theologians is an evidence of what the Church teaches regarding any point of faith or morals,[3] so here the unanimity of interpreters

[1] 12 Nov. 1831, *in una Marsorum.* ad 58, n. 4669.

[2] Sup., n. 44.

[3] Vid. Melchiorem Canum *De Locis Theol.*, lib. viii. cap. iv. n. 3.

may be taken as an evidence of the meaning which the Church intends to convey in the words of her law.[1]

91. But since there is question here, for the most part, of positive laws, which the Church may enforce, modify, or revoke according to circumstances, it is clear that the authority of rubricists, even if unanimous, must yield to a declaration of the Church herself, and therefore is of no weight against a decree of the Sacred Congregation, which, as we have seen,[2] is in this matter the organ of the Church. When we speak, therefore, of the weight to be attached to their authority, we suppose that it is not contravened by any clear declaration of the Church.[3]

92. When rubricists are divided in opinion, we must consider the authority on each side, the character of the writers, and the reasons they give. We should also take into account the time and the place in which they wrote. As there is question of interpreting the rubrics of the Roman Ritual, it may be fairly assumed that those who knew best the Roman practice ought to be the best interpreters of the Ritual. Modern writers also, *cæteris paribus*, should have greater authority, as they alone can be acquainted with those recent decrees which have set at rest so many questions formerly the subject of warm discussion.[4] There are many points on which as yet no clear decision has been given, and regarding which there are different opinions. In treating of these points, though we often indicate a preference for some one opinion, we endeavour to state the others fairly, that the reader may decide for himself.

[1] Falise, *Cours Abregè de Liturgie Pratique*, Introduction, § iii. n. 9. 1°.

[2] Sup., n. **26**. [3] Falise, l. c. 3°. [4] Falise, l. c. 4°.

93. In the appendix will be found a notice of the principal works which we have consulted, and from which we have in great measure compiled the "Notes". Here we shall merely say that we cite no authority at second-hand, except in a few instances; and in these we are careful to give a reference to the work in which we have found the authority cited.

CHAPTER II.

ON WHAT MUST BE OBSERVED GENERALLY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

DE IIS, QUÆ IN SACRAMENTORUM ADMINISTRATIONE GENERALITER SERVANDA SUNT.

§ I.—**Ut ea quæ ex antiquis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ institutis, et sanctorum Canonum Summorumque Pontificum Decretis, de Sacramentorum Ritibus ac Cæremoniis hoc libro præscribuntur, qua par est diligentia ac religione custodiantur, et ubique fideliter observentur; illud ante omnia scire, et observare convenit, quod Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus, sess. vii. can. 13, de iis Ritibus decrevit in hæc verba:** *Si quis dixerit, receptos et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus in solemni Sacramentorum administratione adhiberi consuetos, aut contemni, aut sine peccato à Ministris pro libito omitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque Ecclesiarum Pastorem mutari posse, anathema sit.*

94. The meaning of this first paragraph of the rubrics, and the obligation imposed by the canon of the Council of Trent here cited, have been noticed in the preceding chapter.[1] The rubric itself, it will be seen, here asserts that what the Ritual prescribes regarding the sacraments is taken from the ancient established usage of the Catholic Church, the decrees of the sovereign Pontiffs, and the sacred canons. This is substantially the same as what is asserted in the bull *Apostolicæ Sedi*, viz., that the Ritual

[1] Sup., n. **16.**

contains the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church.[1]

95. The Canon of Trent is thus immediately and directly applied to *the rites prescribed in this Ritual to be observed* in the solemn administration of the Sacraments.[2]

These rites, therefore, may not "be contemned, or "without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers, or "be changed by every pastor of the churches into other "new ones".[3]

96. It is evident that to maintain the proposition condemned by the Canon of Trent would be implicitly to maintain that the Church has not power to institute ceremonies or require their observance under pain of sin, which is an error in faith.[4]

97. "Nor is it without reason", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that the administration of the "Sacraments has been, at all times from the earliest ages "of the Church, accompanied with certain solemn cere- "monies. There is, in the first place, the greatest pro- "priety in manifesting towards the sacred mysteries such "a religious reverence as to appear to handle holy things "holily. The ceremonies themselves also display more "fully, and place as it were before the eyes the effects of "the Sacraments, and impress more deeply on the minds "of the faithful the holiness of these things. They also "elevate to the contemplation of sublime things, the minds

[1] Vid. supra, chap. i. n. 65.

[2] Vid. Falise, *Cours Abrégé*, etc., 3me partie, Introduction, n. 6.

[3] Vid. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, translated by the Rev. J. Waterworth.

[4] Vid. Perrone, *De Sacramentis in genere*, cap. iv.

" of the spectators who observe them with attention, and " excite within them sentiments of faith and charity."[1]

§ II.—**Cum igitur in Ecclesia Dei nihil sanctius, aut utilius, nihilque excellentius, aut magis divinum habeatur, quam Sacramenta ad humani generis salutem a Christo Domino instituta, Parochus, vel quivis alius Sacerdos, ad quem eorum administratio pertinet, meminisse in primis debet, se sancta tractare, atque omni fere temporis momento ad tam sanctæ administrationis officium paratum esse oportere.**

98. " Of the many definitions, each of them seemingly " apt and appropriate, which may serve to explain the " nature of a sacrament, there is none", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[2] " more simple and perspicuous " than that of St. Augustine, a definition which has since " been adopted by all scholastic Doctors: '*A Sacrament*', " says he, '*is a sign of a sacred thing*'; or, as has been said " in other words, but to the same purport, *A Sacrament is a* " *visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justi-* " *fication*". Some, while adopting this definition in substance, make it more clearly and accurately applicable to the sacraments of the Old as well as of the New Law, by putting it in some such form as the following, which is that of Coninck,[3] and is perhaps the most exact definition of a Sacrament in general. " *Res vel cæremonia sacra sen-* " *sibilis ad aliquam sanctitatem pro statu ecclesiæ tunc ex-* " *istentis convenientem hominibus suo usu conferendam* " *et ad veram sanctitatem significandam legitime stabiliter-* " *que instituta*".

[1] Par. ii. cap. i. n. 18. Donovan's *Translation*, Rome, 1839.
[2] Pars. ii. cap. i. n. 4.
[3] *De Sacram. in genere*, Art. iv. Dub. i. n. 17. Edit. Rhotomagi, MDCXXX.

99. The Sacraments of the Old Law conferred only legal sanctity. Those of the New Law confer true internal sanctity. The Sacraments of the New Law, as the Rubric here states, were instituted by Christ for the sanctification and salvation of men. "Through them", says the Council of Trent,[1] "all true justice either begins, or, being begun, "is increased, or, being lost, is repaired". Nothing in the Church, therefore, is more holy, nothing demands to be treated with greater reverence. The parish priest, or any other priest who is charged with the administration of the Sacraments, must always bear this in mind, as he is here admonished, and be prepared at all times to fulfil this sacred duty.

100. During the first three centuries of the Church the pastoral duties were performed by the Bishop, who resided in the chief city of his diocese and was assisted by a number of priests who lived with him. It was not until the fourth century that priests were charged with the care of particular districts. This was the origin of the present parochial system, which was formed by degrees as the faithful increased in number and were scattered through the villages and country districts at a distance from the chief cities.[2]

101. It is the right and the duty of the parish priest, according to the canons, to administer the sacraments to his flock, and as a general rule no other can lawfully administer them in his parish without his permission.

102. But the Bishop has still all the rights of an

[1] Sess. vii. *De Sacrament. Proœmium*, Waterworth's Translation.

[2] Vid. Devoti. *Inst. Can.*, lib. i. tit. iii. sec. x. Bouix, *De Parocho*, Pars. i. sect. i. cap. iv.

ordinary pastor throughout every part of his diocese, and the Pope is the supreme pastor of the universal Church, so that a priest may be authorised by either of them to administer sacraments independently of the parish priest.

103. Hence it is that regulars, in virtue of privileges conferred on them by the Holy See, commonly hear confessions and administer the Eucharist in their churches independently of the parish priest; but their privileges do not extend to the other sacraments (except as regards persons who belong to the order, and cases of necessity), nor even to the Eucharist, when there is question of paschal communion or the viaticum.[1]

§ III.—**Quamobrem illud perpetuo curabit, ut integre, caste, pieque vitam agat; nam etsi Sacramenta ab impuris coinquinari non possint, neque a pravis Ministris eorum effectus impediri: impure tamen et indigne ea ministrantes, in æternæ mortis reatum incurrunt.**

104. It was an error of the Donatists, refuted by St. Augustine and condemned by the Church in the fourth century, that a sacrament could not be validly conferred by a person in mortal sin. This error was revived by Wickliff, and condemned in the Council of Constance. Amongst the articles of Wickliff condemned by that council, the fourth asserts: "Si Episcopus vel sacerdos "est in peccato mortali, non ordinat, non conficit, non "consecrat, non baptizat".[2] The same error having been

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 239, 240.

[2] Concil. Constant. sess. viii. *Articuli Joannis Wickliff.* Labbe, vol. xvi. pag. 119.

adopted by the Anabaptists, was again condemned in the Council of Trent.[1]

105. But though the sacrament be valid, the minister who confers it in the state of mortal sin is guilty of a grievous crime. This is quite certain in the case of a priest who administers a sacrament solemnly and "ex officio".[2] Some theologians maintain that he would not be guilty of mortal sin by merely giving Holy Communion, because, as they say, in this case "non conficit sacramentum".[3] Benedict XIV. cites this opinion, but says the contrary is to be held.[4] St. Liguori also[5] holds that the priest in such a case would be guilty of mortal sin; though he admits, as more probable, that the sin is not multiplied numerically, but only aggravated, by the number of communicants.

106. When baptism is administered in case of necessity by a laic, or even by a priest, not in the state of grace, it is the opinion of many theologians, with St. Thomas, that he is not guilty of mortal sin. St Liguori[6] admits this opinion as probable, but thinks it intrinsically more probable, with Lacroix and others, that the administration of the sacrament even in this case is *per se* a mortal sin, on account of the great irreverence, though *per accidens* the minister may be excused, as he may be called on so suddenly as to be unable previously to elicit an act of contrition.[7] But this excuse can hardly be admitted in case of the pastor, who is bound "ex officio", and may be

[1] Sess. 7, can. xii.
[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 31.
[3] Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, Disp. viii. n. 155.
[4] *De Sacrif. Missæ*, lib. iii. cap. xix. n. 2.
[5] Loc. cit. n. 35.
[6] Lib. vi. n. 32.
[7] Loc. cit. n. 33.

called on at any moment to administer the sacraments. He should be at all times in a condition to administer them, as he is warned in the preceding rubric, in words taken from the instructions of St. Charles Borromeo, and quoted by St. Liguori.[1] With regard to marriage, St. Liguori maintains, as more probable also, that the parties contracting would sin grievously, not only by receiving the sacrament, but by administering it, in a state of mortal sin.[2]

§ IV.—**Sacerdos ergo, si fuerit peccati mortalis sibi conscius (quod absit), ad Sacramentorum administrationem non audeat accedere, nisi prius corde pœniteat: sed si habeat copiam Confessarii, et temporis locique ratio ferat, convenit confiteri.**

107. If a priest, then, should unhappily be conscious of mortal sin, he must not dare to administer any sacrament without having previously made an act of contrition, or gone to confession. The words of the rubric, "**convenit confiteri**", do not imply an obligation of going to confession even when he has the opportunity.

108. If he has to say Mass, he is bound to confess, however contrite he may believe himself to be;[3] but this is by a special precept, affecting those who are about to receive the Eucharist, and commonly understood by theologians to be even a divine precept, implied in the words of the Apostle:[4] "Probet autem seipsum homo", etc.[5]

109. But when there is question of administering a sacrament, even the Eucharist, it is sufficient that he

[1] Ibid. *A fortiori.* [2] Loc. cit. n. 32. *Infertur* 2.
[3] Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii., *De Euch.*, can. xi.
[4] I Cor., xi. 28. [5] St. Lig., lib. vi. 255, 256.

make an act of contrition, or of sorrow which he "bonâ fide" believes to be contrition,[1] though confession is recommended if he has an opportunity. This is the more probable opinion, and the one more commonly held by theologians. St. Liguori even proves it from the words of this very rubric, "**convenit confiteri**", which merely recommend confession, but do not impose it as an obligation.[2]

110. Some, however, insist on the obligation of confessing, because, 1°, The reasons why confession is required in the case of one about to receive the Eucharist may be applied whenever the state of grace must be recovered before administering or receiving any sacrament. 2°, Because a person in the state of sin cannot have true contrition, if, having an opportunity of confessing, he declines to avail himself of it, since true contrition includes a desire of going to confession.[3]

111. These reasons, however, are not conclusive; for we have just seen that there is a special positive precept affecting those who are about to receive the Eucharist, which does not exist with regard to those who administer it, nor with regard to those who either administer or receive any other sacrament. The motive of the precept may be the more effectually to secure purity of conscience in the communicant, and this motive may be more or less applicable in the other cases, it is true; but this

[1] Baruff., Tit. ii. n. 39. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 6 and n. 269. Vid. Suarez, Disp. xvi. Sect. iii. 5 et 6.

[2] Lib. vi. n. 34. Cfr. Bouvier, *De Sacram.*, cap. v., § ii. Quær. 2, 2°.

[3] Catalani, Tit. i. cap. i. § iv. n. 8, *Secundo quia*, etc. Delahogue, *De Sac. in genere*, cap. vi. art. ii., *Præterea ipsa contritio*, etc.

does not suffice to extend the precept to them. The second reason, though specious, is not solid. Contrition, it is true, includes the "*votum sacramenti*", as the Council of Trent teaches,[1] and therefore the desire of confessing and receiving absolution—but at what time? Catalani[2] says, as soon as possible—"quam primum". Few, however, would maintain this opinion. It is enough to have the purpose of confessing *when the precept of confession urges*, and it cannot be shown that a purpose of confessing any sooner is required. A person, therefore, may have true contrition, and thereby recover the state of grace, though he has no intention of going to confession immediately, or on the first opportunity, provided the precept of confession does not urge just then.

112. And here we may see the effect of the special precept regarding the Eucharist: it renders it impossible that any one, conscious of mortal sin, and being about to receive communion, can have true contrition, if, having the opportunity, he neglects to fulfil the precept of confession *which just then urges*. But in the other cases there is no such reason to prevent his having true contrition.

113. In all this we have been considering what the priest is strictly bound to in order to avoid sacrilege. But in reference to his obligations generally, it may be said with perfect truth, that he cannot preserve the necessary purity of conscience unless he makes it his constant study to live "integre, caste, pieque", as is stated in the preceding rubric; and the priest who does so, should he have the misfortune of falling into any grievous sin, will hardly fail to have recourse at once to the tribunal of penance, as the

[1] Sess. xiv. cap. iv. [2] Loc cit.

surest and most efficient means of recovering the state of grace; for few, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches,[1] have that perfect contrition which suffices to blot out sin.

§ V.—Quacumque diei ac noctis hora ad Sacramenta ministranda vocabitur, nullam officio suo præstando, præsertim si necessitas urgeat, moram interponat, ac propterea populum sæpe, prout sese offert occasio, præmonebit, ut cum sacro ministerio opus fuerit, se quamprimum advocet, nulla temporis, aut cujuscumque incommodi habita ratione.

114. A pastor or priest charged with the care of souls is bound to reside within the limits of his parish, and in the parochial house if there be one. This is the general rule, to which few exceptions are allowed.[2] If there be no fixed parochial residence, his house should be so situated that the parishioners can have easy access to him when they require him to administer the sacraments.[3] The statutes of each province or diocese usually determine everything that pertains to the obligation of residence. The priest is, of course, bound to comply with the statutes of the diocese in which he serves.

115. But it is of the greatest importance that he should also attend to the admonition of the present rubric. No doubt it may sometimes happen that the priest is sent for without any real necessity; that the person he is called on to visit is unwilling or unfit to receive the sacraments, etc., etc.; but yet the only safe rule is to obey the sum-

[1] Pare. ii. cap. v. n. 36.
[2] Bouix *De Parocho*, pars. v. cap. ii. § vii.
[3] St. Lig. lib. v. n. 121 et 124, *Parochi autem.*

mons without hesitation or delay. Better surely to make ten visits that are not strictly necessary than fail in one that is so. Hence, he is here admonished to give notice to the people from time to time that they should have no difficulty in calling on him at once when his ministrations are required. This notice might seem superfluous in some places, but there is no place in which it is not useful, for it always emboldens those who might otherwise be afraid or unwilling to call on him until the last moment.

116. Theologians discuss whether or no the pastor is bound to administer the sacraments even at the risk of his life, as in time of pestilence, etc. They are agreed that he is, when there is question of the sacraments necessary to salvation, as Baptism or Penance; but it is probable that he is not, when there is question of any of the other sacraments. Even Baptism and Penance he may administer "per alios", and in some circumstances he should do so, in order that he himself may hear the confessions of those who would otherwise be afraid to come near him, lest they might catch the infection.[1]

§ VI.—Ipse vero antequam ad hujusmodi administrationem accedat, paululum, si opportunitas dabitur, orationi, et sacræ rei quam acturus est, meditationi vacabit, atque ordinem ministrandi, et cæremonias pro temporis spatio prævidebit.

117. Before administering any sacrament he is here recommended to pray and to reflect for a few moments on the sacred act he is going to perform. No particular prayer is prescribed, but the "*Veni Sancti Spiritus*", etc.,

[1] St. Lig. lib. vi. 233. Vid. Benedict XIV. *De Syod. Dioc.* lib. xiii., cap. xix. n. 6.

is very appropriate. It is the prayer recommended by St. Charles.[1] The words "**si opportunitas dabitur**", like the words in the Rubric of the Missal, "**pro temporis opportunitate**",[2] show, according to Baruffaldi,[3] that there is no strict obligation; but it is plain that a compliance with what is here recommended is the best means of securing the gravity and reverence with which these holy functions should be performed.

118. It is very important too, and especially for any one of little experience on the mission, to read attentively beforehand the rubrics regarding the sacrament he is going to administer, that he may have clearly before his mind what he is to do, and how he is to do it. This precaution would often prevent embarrassment to the priest himself, and consequent scandal to those who witness the ceremony; for few cases occur in which he shall not be instructed by the rubric how he is to act.

§ VII.—**In omni Sacramentorum administratione superpelliceo sit indutus, et desuper stola ejus coloris quem Sacramenti ritus exposcit; nisi in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ ministrando occasio vel consuetudo, vel locus interdum aliter suadeat.**

119. In administering the sacraments the priest must be vested in surplice and stole. This is the general rule to which the rubric admits only one exception, apart from cases of necessity. No mention is here made of the soutane, or "vestis talaris", because this is supposed to be the ordinary dress of the priest; but where it is not,

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* Pars iv. § *Instructiones generales de Sacramentorum administratione*, pag. 408.

[2] *De Prep. Sacerd.*, no. 1. [3] *Rit. Rom. Com.* tit. ii., n. 42.

of course it should be put on, as the surplice is worn only over a soutane, or at least a garment which can fairly be called a "vestis talaris".

120. There is some variety in the size and form of the surplice in different places. That which is called the French surplice has no sleeves, but, instead of them, wings or pendants from the shoulders reaching almost to the ground. What is called the Roman surplice is usually shorter and has wide sleeves. The form described by Gavantus[1] and Bauldry,[2] after the instructions of St. Charles, is the one most commonly adopted. There is no general law, however, fixing the precise shape, and each one should follow the approved custom of his diocese. The first Provincial Council of Baltimore, prescribed for the American clergy a particular form of surplice, which it described in its decree as the form used in Rome. But the Sacred Congregation observed that the form described could not be affirmed to be the only form used in Rome, and directed the decree to be altered, so as to order simply: "Superpelliceum esse debere mo- "destum, decorum et sacris functionibus conveniens".[3]

121. The rochet differs from the surplice in being generally shorter, and always having tight sleeves.[4] It is a vestment which properly belongs to bishops, and can be worn by inferior dignitaries only when they have special permission from the Holy See.[5] But in the administration

[1] *De mensuris propriis Sacræ Supellectilis*, pars. v.

[2] *De forma et mensuris Eccl. Supell.*

[3] Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide *Instructio circa decreta a Synodo Provinciali Baltimoriensi edita.* In decreto 32°. Vid. Append.

[4] Gavantus, Par. 2, Tit. 1, n. 2, lit. z.

[5] Macri, *Hierolex* v. *Rochettum.*

of the sacraments, even by canons who may have the use of the rochet, the surplice must be worn, according to several decisions of the Sacred Congregation.[1] Bishops alone who are not members of a religious order, can wear the stole over the rochet.[2]

122. The surplice, according to Gavantus,[3] from the etymology of the word, "*super pelliceum*", and its colour, being a white robe thrown *over* the garments (*tunicas pelliceas*, Gen. iii. 21), that became necessary in consequence of the sin of Adam, signifies the innocence and purity with which we are clothed in putting on the second Adam. Hence the bishop, in conferring tonsure, puts the surplice on each one, saying, "*Induat te Dominus novum "hominem qui secundum Deum creatus est in justitia et "sanctitate veritatis*".[4] And it is a laudable custom, recommended by Baruffaldi,[5] to recite the same prayer while putting on the surplice, changing a single word, and saying "Induat *me* Dominus", etc.

123. The stole is put on over the surplice, so as to fit rather close to the neck, and hang straight over the shoulders in front. It is always worn in this manner over the surplice.[6] But when worn over an alb, with or without a cope, at the altar or elsewhere, it should be always crossed on the breast as it is in vesting for Mass, unless when the celebrant is a bishop.[7] It must be of a colour suited to the sacrament that is to be administered What this colour is, we shall see in treating of each sacra-

[1] 12 Jul. 1628, *in Dub. Urbis* ad 1, n. 753.—31 Mai, 1817, ad 1, *Dub. addit.*, n. 4536.—10 Januar. 1852, *in Cenoman.* ad 5, n. 5165.

[2] Vid. infra Chap. viii. § iii [3] Loc. cit. lit. a.

[4] Pontif. Rom. *De Clerico faciendo.* [5] Tit. ii. n. 48.

[6] Baruff. l. c. n. 49. [7] De Herdt, Tom. i. pars. i, n. 50, i.

ment. There are five ecclesiastical colours, viz., white, red, green, violet, and black—and of these we may here observe that violet is used for Penance, Extreme Unction, and the first part of the ceremony of Baptism; white for the Viaticum, the marriage ceremony, and the second part of Baptism; and the colour of the office of the day, whatever it may be, except black, for the Eucharist, when not administered as the Viaticum.

124. The stole, which was originally a complete garment covering the whole body, assumed its present form after the introduction of the alb.[1] It signifies, mystically, the cords by which our Lord was bound, or the cross which was laid on his shoulders. Morally, it signifies the yoke of Christ and the virtue of obedience.[2] Putting on the stole, the priest should kiss it in the centre, and recite the prayer of the Missal as in vesting for Mass, "*Redde mihi Domine stolam*", etc.[3] This prayer is very appropriate, since it is only by submitting to the yoke of Christ that we can recover what we lost by the disobedience of our first parents.[4]

125. In requiring the use of the surplice and stole, the rubric makes one exception. It does not insist on their use in administering the sacrament of Penance, when the circumstances of time, place, etc., might make it inconvenient, or when there is a custom against it. Baruffaldi[5] observes that many religious hear confessions in the

[1] Merati, Pars. ii, Tit. i. n. xxviii.

[2] Gavantus, Pars. ii. Tit. i. Rub. 6, *Expositio Vestium*. Benedict XIV. *De Sacrif. Miss.* cap. x. n. 7. De Herdt, l. c. n. 51.

[3] Baruff. n. 48. [4] Benedict, XIV. l. c.

[5] Loc. cit. n. 56.

is very appropriate. It is the prayer recommended by St. Charles.[1] The words "**si opportunitas dabitur**", like the words in the Rubric of the Missal, "**pro temporis opportunitate**",[2] show, according to Baruffaldi,[3] that there is no strict obligation; but it is plain that a compliance with what is here recommended is the best means of securing the gravity and reverence with which these holy functions should be performed.

118. It is very important too, and especially for any one of little experience on the mission, to read attentively beforehand the rubrics regarding the sacrament he is going to administer, that he may have clearly before his mind what he is to do, and how he is to do it. This precaution would often prevent embarrassment to the priest himself, and consequent scandal to those who witness the ceremony; for few cases occur in which he shall not be instructed by the rubric how he is to act.

§ VII.—**In omni Sacramentorum administratione superpelliceo sit indutus, et desuper stola ejus coloris quem Sacramenti ritus exposcit; nisi in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ ministrando occasio vel consuetudo, vel locus interdum aliter suadeat.**

119. In administering the sacraments the priest must be vested in surplice and stole. This is the general rule to which the rubric admits only one exception, apart from cases of necessity. No mention is here made of the soutane, or "vestis talaris", because this is supposed to be the ordinary dress of the priest; but where it is not,

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* Pars iv. § *Instructiones generales de Sacramentorum administratione*, pag. 408.

[2] *De Prep. Sacerd.*, no. 1. [3] *Rit. Rom. Com.* tit. ii., n. 42.

of course it should be put on, as the surplice is worn only over a soutane, or at least a garment which can fairly be called a "vestis talaris".

120. There is some variety in the size and form of the surplice in different places. That which is called the French surplice has no sleeves, but, instead of them, wings or pendants from the shoulders reaching almost to the ground. What is called the Roman surplice is usually shorter and has wide sleeves. The form described by Gavantus[1] and Bauldry,[2] after the instructions of St. Charles, is the one most commonly adopted. There is no general law, however, fixing the precise shape, and each one should follow the approved custom of his diocese. The first Provincial Council of Baltimore, prescribed for the American clergy a particular form of surplice, which it described in its decree as the form used in Rome. But the Sacred Congregation observed that the form described could not be affirmed to be the only form used in Rome, and directed the decree to be altered, so as to order simply: "Superpelliceum esse debere mo- "destum, decorum et sacris functionibus conveniens".[3]

121. The rochet differs from the surplice in being generally shorter, and always having tight sleeves.[4] It is a vestment which properly belongs to bishops, and can be worn by inferior dignitaries only when they have special permission from the Holy See.[5] But in the administration

[1] *De mensuris propriis Sacræ Supellectilis*, pars. v.

[2] *De forma et mensuris Eccl. Supell.*

[3] Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide *Instructio circa decreta a Synodo Provinciali Baltimoriensi edita.* In decreto 32°. Vid. Append.

[4] Gavantus, Par. 2, Tit. 1, n. 2, lit. z.

[5] Macri, *Hierolex* v. *Rochettum.*

of the sacraments, even by canons who may have the use of the rochet, the surplice must be worn, according to several decisions of the Sacred Congregation.[1] Bishops alone who are not members of a religious order, can wear the stole over the rochet.[2]

122. The surplice, according to Gavantus,[3] from the etymology of the word, "*super pelliceum*", and its colour, being a white robe thrown *over* the garments (*tunicas pelliceas*, Gen. iii. 21), that became necessary in consequence of the sin of Adam, signifies the innocence and purity with which we are clothed in putting on the second Adam. Hence the bishop, in conferring tonsure, puts the surplice on each one, saying, "*Induat te Dominus novum "hominem qui secundum Deum creatus est in justitia et "sanctitate veritatis*".[4] And it is a laudable custom, recommended by Baruffaldi,[5] to recite the same prayer while putting on the surplice, changing a single word, and saying "Induat *me* Dominus", etc.

123. The stole is put on over the surplice, so as to fit rather close to the neck, and hang straight over the shoulders in front. It is always worn in this manner over the surplice.[6] But when worn over an alb, with or without a cope, at the altar or elsewhere, it should be always crossed on the breast as it is in vesting for Mass, unless when the celebrant is a bishop.[7] It must be of a colour suited to the sacrament that is to be administered What this colour is, we shall see in treating of each sacra-

[1] 12 Jul. 1628, *in Dub. Urbis* ad 1, n. 753.—31 Mai, 1817, ad 1, *Dub. addit.*, n. 4536.—10 Januar. 1852, *in Cenoman.* ad 5, n. 5165.

[2] Vid. infra Chap. viii. § iii

[3] Loc. cit. lit. a.

[4] Pontif. Rom. *De Clerico faciendo.*

[5] Tit. ii. n. 48.

[6] Baruff. l. c. n. 49.

[7] De Herdt, Tom. i. pars. i, n. 50, i.

ment. There are five ecclesiastical colours, viz., white, red, green, violet, and black—and of these we may here observe that violet is used for Penance, Extreme Unction, and the first part of the ceremony of Baptism; white for the Viaticum, the marriage ceremony, and the second part of Baptism; and the colour of the office of the day, whatever it may be, except black, for the Eucharist, when not administered as the Viaticum.

124. The stole, which was originally a complete garment covering the whole body, assumed its present form after the introduction of the alb.[1] It signifies, mystically, the cords by which our Lord was bound, or the cross which was laid on his shoulders. Morally, it signifies the yoke of Christ and the virtue of obedience.[2] Putting on the stole, the priest should kiss it in the centre, and recite the prayer of the Missal as in vesting for Mass, "*Redde mihi Domine stolam*", etc.[3] This prayer is very appropriate, since it is only by submitting to the yoke of Christ that we can recover what we lost by the disobedience of our first parents.[4]

125. In requiring the use of the surplice and stole, the rubric makes one exception. It does not insist on their use in administering the sacrament of Penance, when the circumstances of time, place, etc., might make it inconvenient, or when there is a custom against it. Baruffaldi[5] observes that many religious hear confessions in the

[1] Merati, Pars. ii, Tit. i. n. xxviii.

[2] Gavantus, Pars. ii. Tit. i. Rub. 6, *Expositio Vestium*. Benedict XIV. *De Sacrif. Miss.* cap. x. n. 7. De Herdt, l. c. n. 51.

[3] Baruff. n. 48.

[4] Benedict, XIV. l. c.

[5] Loc. cit. n. 56.

habit of their order. In these countries the surplice is seldom worn in the confessional, but the stole commonly is. Another exception, of course, is the administration of Baptism in case of necessity.[1] With regard to the other sacraments we shall see hereafter,[2] how far necessity can justify their administration without surplice and stole.

§ VIII.—**Adhibebit quoque unum saltem, si habeat, vel plures Clericos, prout loci et Sacramenti ratio postulabit, decenti habitu, et superpelliceo pariter indutos.**

126. The rubric, no doubt, contemplates clerks or clerics in the strict canonical sense, *i.e.*, persons who have received at least the tonsure, for these alone have the privilege of wearing the surplice, according to Baruffaldi,[3] Catalani,[4] Baldeschi,[5] and others. The Council of Trent expresses a wish that a number of clerics should be be attached to every parochial church,[6] and if such were the case, the views of these authors might be strictly adhered to. But it is the case in very few instances at present, and the functions of clerk are now nearly every where performed by laics in soutane and surplice. Seeing that the practice has the sanction, or at least the toleration of the bishops, and that it contributes so much to the decorous celebration of public worship, Cavalieri[7] would

[1] Baruff. l. c. Vid. infra. chap. iii., § xiii.
[2] Infra. chap. xvi. § v.
[3] Loc. cit. n. 60.
[4] Tit. i. § viii. n. iii.
[5] *Esposizione delle Sacre Ceremonie*, tom. i. cap. xii. n. 1.
[6] Sess. xxiii. cap. 17. De Ref.
[7] Tom. iv. cap. iv. in Decr. xiii. n. 19. *De Communione Fidelium.*

not venture to condemn it; neither would De Herdt.[1] Even St. Charles Borromeo, so exact in all that regards ritual observances, allowed it in churches not having a sufficient number of clerics.[2]

127. Those selected for the purpose should be carefully instructed in the ceremonies and duties they are required to perform when serving mass or assisting in the administration of the sacraments. There is no parish in Ireland, and there are few places in any country, in which the priest may not easily find some intelligent boys whom he could instruct in this way; and their assistance, while it would comply with the rubric, would make the ceremony easier for himself and give it an imposing effect which it otherwise could not have. If a number of such boys be once well instructed in any parish, the succession can be easily kept up, as the older and more experienced would train the others. There should be one clerk at least to assist when a sacrament is conferred, but it would be desirable to have two or more on occasions of greater solemnity. Their duties will be mentioned in treating of each sacrament.

128. In no circumstances can a female be allowed simply to perform the duties of a clerk in the administration of the sacraments.[3] But in a convent the chaplain may be accompanied by one of the nuns,[4] not to minister in the strict sense, but to render such assistance as may be necessary.[5]

[1] Tom. i. par. i. n. 50. vi.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* pars. iv. *Instr. de Sacr. Commun.* pag. 607.

[3] Baruff. n. 58. Catal. tit. i. § viii. n. iii.

[4] Baruff. n. 60. Catal. loc. cit. Falise, 8^me^ partie, *Parag. prelim.* n. 6.

[5] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 2. iv.

§ IX.—**Curabit etiam, ut sacra supellex, vestes, ornamenta, linteamina, et vasa ministerii integra, nitidaque sint et munda.**

129. He must take care that the vestments, vessels, and other requisites be kept perfectly clean and in good order. Every parochial church should be in charge of some intelligent person who would act as sacristan, and whose duty it would be to keep the furniture of both church and sacristy in proper order; but it still is necessary, as Baruffaldi observes,[1] for the priest himself to see that this important duty is not neglected. If the vestments, linens, sacred vessels, etc., be not rich or costly, they should be at least "**integra, nitida, et munda**", as the rubric prescribes. This is the answer of Cardinal Bellarmine to the excuse that might here be pleaded on the score of poverty.[2]

§ X.—**In Sacramentorum administratione, eorum virtutem, usum ac utilitatem, et cæremoniarum significationes, ut Concilium Tridentinum præcepit, ex Ss. Patrum et Catechismi Romani doctrina, ubi commode fieri potest, diligenter explicabit**

130. The Council of Trent expressly commands bishops and parish priests to explain to the people, in a manner suited to their capacity, the efficacy and use of the sacraments.[3] The words of the Council seem to imply that this should be done when any sacrament is about being administered, and most rituals contain a brief

[1] Loc. cit. n. 62.
[2] *De Gemitu Columbæ*, lib. ii. cap. v. apud Catal. loc. cit. § ix. n. ii.
[3] Sess. xxiv. cap 7. De Ref.

instruction on the subject, to be then addressed to the people. This time is undoubtedly very appropriate, and is recommended as such by the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[1] whenever there is a considerable number of the faithful present, because, seeing the rite performed before them, they are in a condition to profit better by the instruction they receive. It is not required that he should each time touch on every point, but, as the catechism suggests,[2] he may select one point now, another again, and so on.

131. But the pastor should take other opportunities also of giving instructions on this important subject. He could do so in short familiar lectures before or after mass or vespers on Sundays. In these he could fully explain the necessity of the sacraments, the dispositions with which they must be received, and the ceremonies to be observed in their administration, particularly those ceremonies in which the recipient or the assistants are to take part. While he would thus comply with an important duty of his office, he would save himself a good deal of trouble and annoyance in the actual administration of the sacraments.

132. Everything pertaining to this matter is explained in the Roman Catechism, or Catechism of the Council of Trent, which is here recommended, and in which the pastor will find abundant materials for all his instructions. This book, compiled by the ablest theologians of the day,[3] was published by St. Pius V., pursuant to a decree of the

[1] Part. ii. cap. ii. n. 2. [2] Loc. cit.

[3] Vid. *The Catechism, etc., translated into English*, by Rev. J. Donovan. Rome, 1839. Preface.

Council of Trent, expressly for the use of pastors; and, besides its great authority on this account, it will be found the most convenient book that can be referred to, for though of moderate size, it contains a perfectly clear and methodical statement of all the points of Catholic doctrine and practice in which the pastor should instruct his flock.

§ XI.—**Dum Sacramentum aliquod ministrat, singula verba, quæ ad illius formam et ministerium pertinent, attente, distincte, et pie, atque clara voce pronuntiabit. Similiter et alias Orationes et preces devote ac religiose dicet; nec memoriæ, quæ plerumque labitur, facile confidet, sed omnia recitabit ex libro. Reliquas præterea Cæremonias ac Ritus, ita decenter, gravique actione peraget, ut adstantes ad cœlestium rerum cogitationem erigat, et attentos reddat.**

133. The importance of attending to what is prescribed in this rubric is apparent from reading it. A mistake in a single word of the form might render the sacrament invalid. It is the duty of the minister, therefore, to pronounce the words, as he is here directed, clearly and distinctly. It is unnecessary to discuss how far the change, suppression, or addition of a word or syllable affects the validity of the form. The rule is, that any change which alters the meaning is to be regarded as a substantial one, rendering the sacrament null; but any which leaves the meaning intact is to be regarded as accidental, which, though it may be illicit, does not destroy the validity.[1] Hence, as the meaning of words that are spoken is more easily affected, so is the form

[1] Gury, ii. n. 198, 199.

more easily vitiated, by a change at the commencement of any word than by one at the end;[1] but all danger is avoided by pronouncing the words as here directed. The other prayers prescribed are of less importance, and accordingly we see that in them the rubric is not so exact about the "**singula verba**", but it requires them to be said with religious attention, and will not allow the minister to trust to his memory, but will have him recite them from the book. He should always use the ritual in Baptism, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, in which the prayers and ceremonies are of considerable length, but he can easily dispense with it in Penance, and in giving Holy Communion, as in these the forms are so short and so frequently used by him that, at least after a little practice, there is no danger of mistake in trusting to his memory.[2]

134. The words of the form should be pronounced while the matter is being applied. In the Eucharist the words of the form require that the matter be *physically* present when they are pronounced. In the other sacraments it suffices that the form be pronounced and the matter applied at *morally* the same time. It is not required, *e.g.*, in Baptism, that the water be actually falling on the head, when the word "*baptizo*" is being pronounced. The rubric even directs that the water be poured on in naming the persons of the Blessed Trinity.[3]

135. The admonition regarding the manner of performing the ceremonies is well worthy of notice. The demeanour of the priest cannot but be closely observed

[1] Lacroix, lib. vi. pars i. n. 36. Gury, l.c.

[2] Catal. § xi, n. 3.

[3] Infra. chap. iv. § xvii. Vid. St. Lig. lib vi. n. 9.

by those who are present, and if it gives evidence of piety and a lively faith, it is sure to produce a salutary impression on them; but if, on the contrary, it gives evidence of carelessness or want of gravity, it cannot fail to give great disedification, and thus defeat the very end for which these sacred ceremonies have been instituted.[1]

§ XII.—Ad ministrandum procedens, rei quam tractaturus est, intentus sit, nec de iis, quæ ad ipsum non pertinent, quidquam cum alio colloquatur: in ipsaque administratione actualem attentionem habere studeat, vel saltem virtualem, cum intentione faciendi quod in eo facit Ecclesia.

136. We must carefully distinguish *at*tention from *in*tention—the former being defined "an act of the intellect considering what a person is doing"; the latter "an act of the will tending to some desired end".[2] The distinction, however, is understood from the words themselves, as easily perhaps as from any definition of them. In administering a sacrament the priest, according to the rubric, should endeavour to have actual or at least virtual attention. It is hard to understand how there can be attention at all, unless it be actual. St. Liguori maintains that it is impossible.[3] By virtual attention the rubric most probably means the absence of *voluntary* distraction. The explanation of Baruffaldi[4] almost comes to this; and it is in this sense virtual attention seems to be used by La Croix.[5] Attention in the act of conferring a sacrament is not necessary to its validity, but to be voluntarily dis-

[1] Vid. supra, n. 97.
[2] Gury, ii. n. 202, 203.
[3] Lib. vi. n. 14.
[4] Tit. ii. n. 73.
[5] Lib. vi. p. i. n. 84.

tracted is at least a venial sin, and in the consecration of the Eucharist is very probably a mortal sin.[1] Attention is required chiefly in pronouncing the form and in reciting the prayers. It may be directed: 1° to the words, so as to pronounce them well; 2° to the sense of the words, which is better; 3° to God and to the object of the sacred rite, which is best of all.[2]

137. It has been defined by the Council of Trent, that in conferring a sacrament the minister must have the intention of doing what the Church does.[3] There are various ways in which a person may be conceived to have an intention in doing a thing. 1° He may have an *actual* intention at the moment he does it. 2° He may have a *virtual* intention, *i.e.*, he may do it in *virtue* of an actual intention which he had, and which still continues in some effect, though he does not think of it; as, *e.g.*, if a priest leaves his house with the intention of baptizing a child, and *in virtue* of this intention goes to the church and performs the ceremony, though in the act he is quite distracted and does not reflect on what he is doing. 3° He may have an *habitual* intention, *i.e.*, he may have had the intention and may not have retracted it; but yet it does not continue in any effect, nor can it be said that the act is performed in virtue of it. 4° He may have what is called an *interpretative* intention, *i.e.*, he may be so disposed in doing the act, that *if* he had adverted to it, he *would have had* such an intention in doing it. These seem to be the distinctions as laid down by St. Liguori,[4]

[1] St. Lig. l. c. [2] St. Lig. lib. v. n. 176. *Attentio autem.*
[3] Sess. vii. can. xi. *De. Sac. in genere.* [4] Lib. vi. n. 15.

according to whom it is certain, that neither the habitual nor the interpretative intention is sufficient; that the actual intention is not required; but that the virtual is required, and is quite sufficient.[1]

138. So much for the intention as it is an act of the mind. With respect to the object of this intention, it must be "to do what the Church does", and the intention may be directed to this object in two ways, explicitly and implicitly. A well-instructed pious Catholic in baptizing an infant would have the *explicit* intention of "doing "what the Church does", while a heretic, or an infidel, not believing in the true Church or in the efficacy of the sacrament, but yet intending, in the act of baptizing, to do what is done amongst Christians, would have the *implicit* intention of "doing what the Church does", and such implicit intention suffices for the validity.[2]

139. It is quite certain, then, that a virtual implicit intention is sufficient, but it is a question amongst divines whether this intention must be *internal*, or whether it be not enough for the validity to perform the external rite seriously and in proper circumstances, even though the minister should mentally exclude the intention of doing what the Church does. This is the famous question of the *external* and *internal* intention, which was for a time warmly debated in the schools. It is generally admitted now, that the weight of authority and reason is completely in favour of the necessity of the internal; and the other opinion barely escapes condemnation by Alexander VIII, who condemned the proposition: "Valet Baptismus col-

[1] Loc. cit. n. 16, 17, 18. [2] Ibid, n. 22.

latus a ministro qui omnem ritum externum formamque baptizandi observat, intus vero in corde suo apud se resolvit: Non intendo facere quod facit Ecclesia".[1] At least it cannot be denied, according to Benedict XIV., that this is a very severe blow to it;[2] and should there be, in any case, sufficient reason to think that the internal intention was wanting in the administration of Baptism, or any other sacrament that cannot be iterated, the sacrament should be again conferred conditionally, or, if time permit, the Holy See should be consulted.[3] The question, however, is very speculative, for in practice the internal intention is hardly ever wanting.

§ XIII.—**Illud porro diligenter caveat, ne in Sacramentorum administratione aliquid quavis de causa vel occasione, directe vel indirecte exigat, aut petat; sed ea gratis ministret et ab omni simoniæ, atque avaritiæ suspicione, nedum crimine, longissime absit. Si quid vero nomine eleemosynæ, aut devotionis studio, peracto jam Sacramento, sponte a Fidelibus offeratur, id licite pro consuetudine locorum accipere poterit, nisi aliter Episcopo videatur.**

140. The priest must not only be free from the crime of simony, the essential malice of which consists in estimating a spiritual thing at a temporal price,[4] but he must also be careful to keep himself free from the least suspicion of it; and on the occasion of administering a sacrament, therefore, he must take care to avoid exacting the

[1] 7 Dec. 1690. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, xcxviii. n. 1185.

[2] *De Syn. Dioc.* lib. vii. cap. iv. n. 8.

[3] Ibid. n. 9.

[4] Busemb. apud St. Lig. lib. iv. n 49. *Unde patet.* Suarez, *De Simonia*, cap i n. 1.

customary oblations in any way that might leave him open to such a suspicion. It is enough to cite here the admonition of the Synod of Thurles, which may serve as a practical commentary on this rubric: "In oblationibus "quæ ex veteri et recepto usu fieri solent occasione "administrationis quorundam Sacramentorum, caveant "Parochi ne aliquid fiat quod simoniam aut avaritiam "sapiat. Sacramenta vero nunquam denegentur eo sub "prætextu quod oblationes istæ dandæ non sint; alioquin "noverint delinquentes se ad arbitrium Ordinarii esse "puniendos".[1]

§ XIV.—**Fidelibus alienæ Parochiæ Sacramenta non ministrabit, nisi necessitatis causa, vel de licentia Parochi, seu Ordinarii.**

141. A parish priest can *validly* administer the sacraments to all who present themselves within the limits of his parish. There could be no difficulty about any except the sacrament of Penance, but it is certain that he has jurisdiction to hear in his own parish the confessions, not only of his own parishioners, but of any who present themselves. Indeed any priest, at the present day, who is authorized to hear confessions in a parish, is understood, by the universal custom of the Church, to have authority to hear there all who present themselves to him, no matter from what place they may come.[2] A parish priest can hear the confessions of his own parishioners everywhere, even outside his own diocese;[3] but he cannot

[1] *De Sacramentis*, n. 5.

[2] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 564, et 569. Benedict XIV. *Instit.* xviii. n. 9.

[3] Gury, vol. ii. n. 541. Bouix. *De Parocho*, pars. iv. cap. iv. n. 8.

hear the confessions of others beyond the limits of his own parish, unless where he is understood by custom, as is the case in many places, to have jurisdiction in every part of the diocese.[1]

142. He can *licitly* confer sacraments on those of another parish: 1° In case of necessity, but this can ordinarily apply only to Baptism and Penance; 2° When there is an express or implied understanding with the parish priest, for then in reality he acts "**de licentia**". 3° By custom he can not only validly but licitly hear their confessions, even in paschal time, when they come to him in his own parish;[2] and he can also give them Communion, unless it be the Paschal Communion, which they are bound to receive from their own pastor.[3] He cannot lawfully administer sacraments to them in other cases without the permission of their parish priest or Ordinary.[4]

§ XV.—**Omnes autem qui Sacramenta suscipiunt, loco et tempore opportuno monebit, ut remoto inani colloquio, et habitu, actuque indecenti, pie ac devote Sacramentis intersint, et ea qua par est reverentia suscipiant.**

143. The admonition here recommended should be given in general terms, so as not to mark out any individual.[5] It is to be given "**loco et tempore opportuno**", and perhaps it could be most conveniently given in the instructions already mentioned.[6] By this means the risk of giving offence to individuals would be avoided.

[1] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 544. *Dub.* 2. Lacroix, lib. vi. pars. ii. n. 1536. Bouix, l. c. n. 4.
[2] St. Lig. n. 564.
[3] St. Lig. n. 300. Vid. infra. chap. xiii. § i.
[4] Vid. infra. chap. xvi. § i.
[5] Baruff. tit. ii. n. 80.
[6] Supra. n 131.

§ XVI.—**Librum hunc Ritualem, ubi opus fuerit, semper cum ministrabit, secum habebit, Ritusque et Cæremonias in eo præscriptas diligenter servabit.**

144. We have treated in the preceding chapter[1] of the obligation of using the Roman Ritual, and observing all that is prescribed by its rubrics. The priest is here admonished that he should always have a copy of it with him when he is about to administer a sacrament.[2]

§ XVII.—**Cæterum illorum tantum Sacramentorum, quorum administratio ad Parochos pertinet, Ritus hoc opere præscribuntur, cujusmodi sunt Baptismus, Pœnitentia, Eucharistia, Extrema unctio, et Matrimonium. Reliqua vero duo Sacramenta Confirmationis et Ordinis, cum propria sint Episcoporum, Ritus suos habent in Pontificali præscriptos. Et ea quæ de iis atque aliis Sacramentis scire, servare, et docere Parochi debent, cum ex aliis Libris, tum præcipue ex Catechismo Romano sumi possunt. Siquidem hic de iis fere tantum agere instituti operis ratio postulat, quæ ad ipsorum quinque Sacramentorum ritus pertinent.**

145. The Ritual treats only of those sacraments that are administered by priests. What regards confirmation and orders, which are conferred only by bishops, may be found in the "Pontificale Romanum". But though the priest is not the minister of these sacraments, it may be his duty to explain to the people the doctrine which relates to them,[3] and especially it is the duty of the pastor to prepare the children of his parish for the worthy recep-

[1] Vid. n. 65. et seq.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 133.
[3] Baruff. n. 91.

tion of the sacrament of Confirmation, and hence he is here referred to such books as may enable him to fulfil his duty in this respect; but, above all, to the Roman Catechism, or Catechism of the Council of Trent, the advantages of which we have had occasion to point out before.[1]

§ XVIII.—**Postremo, quisquis Sacramenta administrare tenetur, habeat libros necessarios ad officium suum pertinentes, eosque præsertim, in quibus Parochialium functionum notæ ad futuram rei memoriam describuntur, ut ad finem hujus Ritualis habetur.**

146. The books here specially referred to are the Parochial registers, of which there are five, according to the Roman Ritual, to be kept in the manner prescribed at the end of the Ritual itself, viz: 1° of Baptisms; 2° of Confirmations; 3° of Marriages; 4° of every family with its members, noting the sacraments received by each, called the "Liber Status Animarum"; 5° of the faithful departed. At least the registers of Baptisms and Marriages must be kept with great care, and the Synod of Thurles directs parish priests to keep them in the manner prescribed by the Roman Ritual, "ad normam Ritualis "Romani".[2]

147. With regard to other books which treat of matters pertaining to the duties of his office, it is enough to observe that it is impossible for any priest to fulfil the duty of administering the sacraments and instructing the people, unless he be devoted to sacred study,[3] and, there-

[1] Supra, n. 132.
[2] *De Parochis*, n. 27.
[3] Vid. St. Lig. *Praxis Confessarii*. n. 18. prope finem.

fore, unless he have a supply of good books. Speaking of pastors, the Synod of Thurles says: "Lectioni præterea "attendant et supellectilem librorum ecclesiasticorum "sibi comparent; saltem sacra Biblia, et unum integrum "Theologiæ cursum, canones Concilii Tridentini, Cate- "chismum Romanum, et vitas Sanctorum habeant et "assidue versant".[1]

"Sacerdotes, jam ad munera ecclesiastica admissi", says the Synod of Westminster, "non ideo studiis, præ- "cipue sacris, valedicant: sed cum ex ore sacerdotis scien- "tiam populi requirere debeant (*Mal.*, ii. 7), sint assidui "in lectione S. Scripturæ, et theologiæ tam dogmaticæ "quam moralis et asceticæ. Ita fiet, ut, gregem in- "struentes, non inanibus verbis hominum tantum pulsa- "bunt aures, non contra inimicos dimicabunt, velut aerem "verberantes, sed et illos fructuose vero vitæ pane "nutrient, et hos solida argumentatione profligabunt".[2]

[1] *De Vita et Honestate Clericorum*, n. 23.

[2] Decr. xxiv. *De Vita et Honestate Clericorum*, 10°.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

DE SACRAMENTO BAPTISMI RITE ADMINISTRANDO.

§ I.—**Sacrum Baptisma, Christianæ Religionis et æternæ vitæ janua, quod inter alia novæ Legis Sacramenta a Christo instituta, primum tenet locum, cunctis ad salutem necessarium esse, ipsa Veritas testatur illis verbis:** *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei* (Joan. 3.) **Itaque summa ad illud opportune, ritoque administrandum ac suscipiendum diligentia adhibenda est.**

148. Baptism is defined by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "Sacramentum regenerationis per "aquam in verbo". "The sacrament of regeneration by water in the word", *i.e.*, the sacrament by which we are spiritually regenerated or born again, by an ablution of water with the prescribed form, "Ego te baptizo in "Nomine Patris", etc. It had various other names besides Baptism amongst the early Fathers and ecclesiastical writers. It is called the Sacrament of Faith, of Illumination, etc.[1]

149. By Baptism we are cleansed from original sin, made members of the Church, children of God, and heirs to the kingdom of Heaven. "By nature", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[2] "we are born from Adam

[1] Vid. Bellarmine, *De Baptismo*, cap. i. [2] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 5.

"children of wrath, but by Baptism we are regenerated "in Christ children of mercy, for he gave power to men, "'to be made the sons of God, to them that believe in "'his name, who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of "'the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God' (*John*, i. 12, 13)". This spiritual regeneration, then, by Baptism, is absolutely necessary to salvation, as has been defined by the Council of Trent,[1] and as is clearly inferred from the words of our Lord here cited, "*Nisi quis renatus*", etc.—"Unless a man be born again of water and the "Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God".[2]

150. The word *water* in this text has always been understood by the Fathers in the literal sense, and the Council of Trent[3] has anathematized those who, with Calvin,[4] distort its meaning by taking it metaphorically. We see that our Lord himself baptized, as is related in the same chapter[5] (though by the ministry of his disciples, as appears from what the Evangelist afterwards states);[6] that he commissioned his apostles to baptize,[7] and that they did baptize all who received the gospel;[8] while the nature of the baptism administered is evident from the history of the baptism of the eunuch[9] and of the Gentile converts,[10] in which there is distinct mention of water. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the meaning of our Saviour's words, "to be born again of water", is simply

[1] Sess. vii. can. 5, *De Baptismo*.
[2] John, chap. iii. 5.
[3] Sess. vii. can. 2. *De Baptismo*.
[4] *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 15, cit. apud Tournel. *De Baptismo Quæstio*, i. art. ii.
[5] Vs. 23, 26.
[6] Chap. iv. 2.
[7] Math., xxviii. 19.
[8] Act., ii. 41.
[9] Act., viii. 36.
[10] Ib., x. 47.

"to be regenerated by Baptism", and this is declared necessary to salvation.

151. Moreover, the expression implies that it is necessary, not merely as the fulfilment of a precept is necessary, because its voluntary omission would be a sin, *necessitate præcepti;* but that it is absolutely necessary as a means positively conducing to salvation, so that without it salvation could not be attained, even though its omission were involuntary, *necessitate medii.* This is shown by the universality of the form "*Nisi* QUIS", etc., by which it extends to all, even those to whom a precept could not be addressed, as infants, but still more perhaps by the implied assertion, that this regeneration is as necessary to spiritual life and admission into the kingdom of God, as birth according to the flesh is to natural life, an assertion which is confirmed by what our Saviour immediately adds: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that "which is born of the Spirit is spirit",[1] for what St. Paul so clearly expresses,[2] is here understood, viz., "that flesh "and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God".[3]

152. But though Baptism is thus necessary to salvation, its defect in those who, through no fault of their own, are unable to receive it, may be supplied in two ways, according to the common doctrine of the Fathers: 1° by an act of perfect charity which includes the desire of Baptism, and which is called *Baptismus Flaminis;* 2° by martyrdom, which is called *Baptismus Sanguinis,* and by which even infants, who are put to death for

[1] John, iii. 6. [2] I. Cor. xv. 50.
[3] Vid. Corn. A. Lapide. *Comment.* in Joan. iii. 6.

Christ, as were the Holy Innocents, may be saved.[1] There is no other means of supplying for the Baptism of water, or *Baptismus Fluminis*, which is always meant by the word Baptism, when used simply and without any adjunct, and which alone is a sacrament.

153. It is here said to be "**Christianæ Religionis et æternæ "vitæ januæ**", for although without it salvation may be attained in the two cases we have mentioned, no one properly belongs to the body of the Church, or is capable of receiving any other sacrament, without the spiritual character which it alone impresses on the soul.[2]

§ II.—**Cum autem ad hoc Sacramentum conferendum alia sint de Jure divino absolute necessaria, ut materia, forma, minister; alia ad illius solemnitatem pertineant, ut Ritus ac Cæremoniæ, quas ex Apostolica et antiquissima traditione acceptas et approbatas, nisi necessitatis causa, omittere non licet; de iis aliqua præmonenda sunt, ut sacrum hoc ministerium rite ac sancte peragatur.**

154. In every sacrament three things are essential, the matter, the form, and the minister: "Hæc omnia "Sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet rebus tan- "quam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona minis- "tri conferentis Sacramentum cum intentione faciendi "quod facit Ecclesia: quorum si aliquod desit non perfi- "citur sacramentum".[3] The words, matter and form, as applied to the sacraments, were introduced by the scholastics, being found in no writer earlier than the thirteenth

[1] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 95. et seq. Vid. Bellarmine, *De Bapt.* cap. vi.
[2] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 79. Cfr. Murray, *De Ecclesia*, Disp. iii. sec. vii.
[3] Decret. Eugenii IV., *ad Armenos*. Labbe, vol. xviii. pag. 547.

century;[1] but the things signified by them were always distinguished. In every sacrament there is a something to be determined, which we now call the "matter", and which in ancient writers is called "res", "elementum", etc.; and there is that which determines it, which we now call the form, and which in ancient writers is called the "verbum"; since it, at least ordinarily, consists in words. This distinction is clearly expressed in the well-known citation from St. Augustine: "Detrahe verbum et quid "est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum et "fit Sacramentum".[2] The minister too is essential, for he must apply the matter and form with the intention of doing what the Church does.[3] In the administration of Baptism, besides what is essential to the Sacrament, certain rites and ceremonies, which have been in use from the earliest times, are to be observed. The rubrics proceed to give instructions on all these in order.

THE MATTER OF BAPTISM.

DE MATERIA BAPTISMI.

§ III.—Ac primum intelligat Parochus, cum hujus Sacramenti materia sit aqua vera ac naturalis, nullum aliud liquorem ad id adhiberi posse.

155. The matter of a sacrament is distinguished into "remote" and "proximate"; the remote being that which is applied or used, the proximate being the application or

[1] Baruff. tit. iv. n. 1. Drouin. *De Re Sacramentaria*, cap i. § 4.
[2] *Tract* 80. *in Joan.* cit. apud Drouin. l. c.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 137.

use of the remote, in the act of administering.[1] Thus, in Baptism, water is the remote matter, and ablution with water is the proximate matter.

156. That water alone is the matter of Baptism, is proved by the reasons already mentioned in treating of its necessity.[2] Any liquid which can be, simply and properly speaking, called "*water*", whether it be hot or cold, salt or fresh, is sufficient for the validity of the sacrament. The admixture of any other ingredient does not interfere with the validity, provided the liquid still retains, in common estimation, the nature and properties of water. This is the rule by which theologians determine whether any proposed liquid be sufficient or not, for the matter of the sacrament.[3] But in case of necessity even doubtful matter may, and should be used, when no other can be had.[4]

157. Many very congruous reasons are assigned by the Fathers and theologians, why water was selected by Christ in preference to any other element. "In the "first place, water, which is always at hand, and is easily "procured by all, was a most fit matter of a sacrament "necessary to all, without exception, to attain life;[5] next, "water admirably expresses the effect of Baptism, for as "water washes away uncleanness, so also does it strik- "ingly illustrate the virtue and efficacy of Baptism, which "washes away the stains of sin. Moreover, as water is ex-

[1] Vid. Gury. vol. ii. n. 196.
[2] Supra, n. 150.
[3] Vid. St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 103.
[4] Ibid. *Et hic sedulo*, etc.
[5] The translation from which we copy has "maintain", but this is probably a misprint for "attain"; the original being "ad consequendam vitam".

"tremely well adapted to cool bodies, so does Baptism in "a great measure extinguish the ardour of the passions".[1]

§ IV.—**Aqua vero solemnis Baptismi sit eo anno benedicta in Sabbato Sancto Paschatis vel Sabbato Pentecostes, quæ in fonte mundo nitida et pura diligenter conservetur; et hæc, quando nova benedicenda est, in Ecclesiæ vel potius Baptisterii sacrarium effundatur.**

158. Though common water, as has been said, is sufficient for the validity of the sacrament, the water used in the administration of solemn Baptism should have been blessed on the Holy Saturday, or on the Saturday of Pentecost, immediately preceding. Merati shows that the custom of blessing the water used in Baptism has existed in the Church from the earliest times:[2] and according to the common opinion of theologians, there is an obligation *sub mortali*, of using blessed water in solemn baptism.[3]

159. On the days above mentioned, the water is blessed according to the form prescribed in the Roman Missal; at other times it is blessed according to the form prescribed in the Ritual,[4] and should always be preserved with great care in the baptismal font. What remains when new water is to be blessed, should be poured into the sacrarium of the church, or that of the baptistery, if it have one annexed;[5] and even what is used, as we

[1] Cat. Conc. Trid., par. ii. cap. ii. n. 10.
[2] Pars. iv. tit. x. n. xxxvii. Vid. infra, chap. ix. § vi.
[3] Vid. St. Lig. lib. v. n. 102, *in fine in parenth.*
[4] Infra, chap. ix.
[5] Vid. infra, § xxxii.

shall see, should be poured, or allowed to fall, into the same place.[1]

§ V.—**Si aqua benedicta tam imminuta sit, ut minus sufficere videatur, alia non benedicta admisceri potest, in minori tamen quantitate.**

160. It is doubtful whether one or two drops of water would suffice.[2] According to the common opinion there must be an *ablution*, which supposes the water to flow on the part to which it is applied.[3] When the supply in the font is insufficient, it is here stated that common water may be added, but it must be in less quantity.

161. Since there is no restriction as to the number of times, it would seem that this addition of common water in small quantities, may be made as often as is necessary, though the quantity of unblessed water thus added may, in the end, exceed that of the blessed water which remained in the font when the first addition was made. This is the opinion of Cavalieri.[4] It was expressly decided with respect to the holy oils, that unblessed oil may be added in this way.[5] And if this be true of what is essential to the sacrament of Extreme Unction,[6] we may infer that the same will hold for the baptismal water, in which the benediction is by no means required for the validity.

[1] Infra, § xii.

[2] St. Lig. n. 107. *Quær.* vi.

[3] Billuart. *De Bapt.* dis. i. art. iii. § iii. Collet. *De Bapt.* art. ii. concl. i.

[4] Tom. iv. cap. xxii. Dec. x. n. v.

[5] Sac. Cong. Conc. Sept. 23d, 1682. Vid. infra, § xxxv.

[6] Vid. chap. xv. § iii.

§ VI.—**Si vero corrupta fuerit, aut effluxerit, aut quovis modo defecerit, Parochus in fontem bene mundatum ac nitidum, recentem aquam infundat, eamque benedicat ex formula quæ infra præscribitur.**

162. Provision is here made for the case in which the water becomes unfit for use, or the supply, from whatever cause, altogether fails. Water that has been for a considerable time stagnant often becomes corrupt,[1] and might be injurious to infants if used in their baptism.[2] The font, too, may be leaky or porous, so as to retain the water but a short time, and the present rubric directs what is to be done in such cases. The font is to be thoroughly cleansed, the putrid water, if any remains, being thrown into the sacrarium; and a new supply having been poured in, is to be blessed according to the formula given hereafter.[3]

163. A mucous film is soon formed on the surface of the font from the oils used in the benediction. This does not render the water unfit for use, but may be removed, according to Baruffaldi,[4] without any injury or irreverence, just as the oil used in the consecration of a chalice. It may be removed with a little cotton and burned, or thrown into the sacrarium.

§ VII.—**Sed si aqua congiaciata sit, curetur ut liquefiat: sin autem ex parte congelata, sit, aut nimium frigida, poterit parum aquæ naturalis non benedictæ calefacere, et admiscere aquæ baptismali in vasculo ad id parato, et ea tepefacta ad baptizandum uti ne noceat infantulo.**

[1] Baruff. tit. iv. n. 13.
[2] Baruff. ibid. n. 16.
[3] Chap. ix.
[4] Tit. iv. n. 10.

164. Water in the solid state, as ice, cannot be used for Baptism, for there cannot be an *ablution* with it in this state; at least it is very doubtful matter, and can be used, therefore, only in case of necessity, and then *sub conditione*.[1] But if it be dissolved in the act of application it is certainly valid.[2]

165. The rubric here directs that if the water in the font be congealed, it must be liquefied before use. This may be done in various ways. A little may be taken from the font and reduced by the application of heat to the liquid state;[3] or, as the rubric here directs, a little common water may be heated and mixed with some taken from the font, in a vessel provided for the purpose. The same should be done, even when the water is not frozen, if it be too cold to be poured, with safety, on the child; but the common water used should always be less in quantity than that taken from the font, as is directed by St. Charles in his instructions,[4] and as might be inferred from a preceding rubric.[5] In the Greek church warm water is used, according to Goar,[6] not only to guard against danger to the infant, but also because the warmth is regarded as a symbol of the fervour of grace produced by Baptism.

[1] St. Lig. n 104. *Dub.* 4°.

[2] Lacroix, lib. vi. p. i. n. 262.

[3] Rit. Leod. et Past. Brug. apud De Herdt, p. vi. n. 3. § vi.

[4] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* pars. iv. *Instructiones de Bapt. administratione*, pag. 410.

[5] Supra, n. 160.

[6] ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ sive *Rituale Græcorum Illustratum, In Baptismatis Officium Notæ*, n. 24, pag. 366.

ON THE FORM OF BAPTISM.

DE FORMA BAPTISMI.

§ VIII.—**Quoniam Baptismi forma his verbis expressa: *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, omnino necessaria est, ideo eam nullo modo licet mutare, sed eadem verba uno et eodem tempore quo fit ablutio pronuntianda sunt.**

166. We have already[1] mentioned the rules by which one may determine what change in the form of a sacrament is to be regarded as substantial, and what as merely accidental. We shall add merely that when the change is such as to leave it doubtful whether or not the sense is substantially altered, the validity very often depends on the intention of the minister.[2]

167. It is never lawful to change the words of the form as here given in the rubric. It is admitted, however, that the omission of the pronoun "Ego" would not invalidate the sacrament.[3] Neither would the omission of the *et* before *Filii*, nor, according to the more probable opinion, of the preposition *in;* but this last omission, as it would leave the validity doubtful, could not be excused from mortal sin.[4] All the other words are essential.

168. St. Liguori seems to suppose that the word "Amen" is as much a part of the form as the pronoun "*Ego*", for he says the omission of neither one nor

[1] *Supra*, n. 133.

[2] *St. Lig.* lib. vi. n. 112.

[3] Cfr Lacroix, lib. vi. pars i. n. 38.

[4] Ibid. *Dub* 2. *in fine.*

other would invalidate the sacrament, nor exceed a venial sin.[1] The same is supposed by several theologians whom he cites. It is evidently supposed by Lacroix[2] and by Gury.[3]

Now the truth is, that the word "Amen" does not belong to the form at all, nor is it given in any correct edition of the Ritual. The authority of the theologians, however, and especially of St. Liguori, suggested a doubt on the matter which was proposed to the Sacred Congregation, and answered as follows: "Plures Theologi "inter quos Sanctus Alphonsus Marie de Ligorio sentiunt "veniale esse omittere vocem, 'Amen' in fine formæ "Baptismi, quæ tamen vox non reperitur in Rituali Ro- "mano: quæritur ergo utrum adhibenda sit vel omit- "tenda?" Resp: "Strictim in casu servetur Rituale "Romanum".[4] It is not permitted, therefore, to add the word "Amen" to the form.

169. The Apostles are stated to have baptized "in "nomine Jesu Christi",[5] and these words were understood by some to be the form which they used. If this interpretation be admitted, it must be said, with St. Thomas,[6] that the Apostles did so in virtue of a special revelation, in order that the name of Christ might be thus more highly honoured.[7] But it is much more probable that the words mean simply that the Apostles administered the Baptism instituted by Christ, and therefore with the form instituted by Him. That they bap-

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Loc. cit. n. 43. [3] Vol. ii. n. 241.
[4] 9 Jun. 1853, *in Cochin.* ad. 2, n. 5188.
[5] Acts, ii. 38., viii. 12., etc. [6] 3 p. qu. 66, art. 6, ad. 1.
[7] Vid. Cat. Conc. Trid., p. ii. cap. ii. n. 15.

tized with the explicit mention of the three divine persons, may be inferred from *Acts* xix., where the question of St. Paul clearly implies that those who received the baptism of Christ must have heard the name of the Holy Ghost.[1]

170. The form must be pronounced while the matter is being applied, that is, at *morally* the same time.[2]

§ IX.— Latinus Presbyter latina forma semper utatur.

171. The form above given is that which a priest of the Latin Church is bound to use. In some of the ancient liturgical books used in France, certain words are added after "Spiritus Sancti", as "ut habeas vitam æter-"nam—Amen"; "in remissionem peccatorum ut habeas "vitam æternam"; "ut habeas vitam æternam in sæcula "sæculorum".[3] Such additions do not affect the validity, but they are no longer in use anywhere, nor are they at present allowable, as is plain from the answer of the Sacred Congregation before cited.[4]

172. In the Greek Church the form used is "Bapti-"zatur servus Christi in nomine Patris", etc.; or, as it is in the Euchologium, or Ritual of the Greeks: "Baptiza-"tur servus Dei in nomine Patris", etc. This form is declared valid in the decree of Eugene IV., "Pro instruc-tione Armenorum".[5] Though the form "Baptizetur",

[1] St. Lig. n. 112, Dub. 3. Vid. Bellarmine, *De Bapt.* lib. i. cap. 3.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 134.
[3] Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xiv. n. 15.
[4] Sup. n. 168.
[5] Labbe, vol. xviii. pag. 547.

etc., in the imperative mood, is likewise declared valid in the same decree, at least according to a common reading, and is often mentioned as the form used by the Greeks; it is maintained by Arcudius,[1] that this form is not, and never was, in use amongst them. Cardinal de Lugo maintains the same,[2] so also does Collet.[3]

"Baptizatur", etc., is the only form found in the "Euchologium", published and commented on by Goar;[4] and the same is to be said of that which is cited by Martene.[5] In the "ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΜΕΓΑ",[6] the words of the form are: "Βαπτίζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ (ὁ δεῖνα) εἰς τὸ "ὄνομα", etc. The indicative is also the only form given in a Compendium of Theology published for the use of ecclesiastical students in the schismatic Russo-Greek Church.[7] It says: "Forma Baptismi (ex antiqua praxi "Ecclesiæ Græcæ et nostræ Russicæ) hæc est: Bapti- "zatur servus Dei in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus "Sancti"[8].

It is worthy of note that the word "Baptizetur", in the text of the decree of Eugene IV., as given by Labbe,[9] is marked by an asterisk, referring to the word "Baptizatur" printed in the margin, which intimates that "Baptizatur" is another, and perhaps the correct, reading. The words

[1] Apud Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § ix. n. 2.

[2] *De Sacramentis*, disp. ii. sec. vi. n. 109.

[3] *De Baptismo*, cap. iv. art. iii., Conclusio. i.

[4] ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ sive *Rituale Græcorum Illustratum*. Officium Sancti Baptismatis, pag. 350 et seq.

[5] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ord. xxii. et seq.

[6] Edit. EN BENETIA, 1854.

[7] Petropoli, 1799.

[8] Cap. lvii. *De Baptismo*, § 10.

[9] Loc. cit.

are "Forma autem est: "*Ego te Baptizo in nomine Patris* "*et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.* Non tamen "negamus quin et per illa verba: *Baptizetur "talis servus Christi in nomine Patris et "Filii et Spiritus Sancti; vel, baptizatur manibus meis "talis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, verum "perficiatur baptisma".

*Baptizatur.

Goar says that the similarity of "Baptizetur" to the Greek verb gave rise to the error. "Propter dictionis "Βαπτίζεται affinitatem ad aliam vocem Latinam 'Bapti- "'zetur', commenti sunt quidam Græcos in Baptismate "deprecatoriâ vel imperativâ formâ uti".[1]

§ X.—**Cum Baptismum iterare nullo modo liceat, si quis sub conditione, de quo infra, sit baptizandus, ea conditio explicanda est hoc modo:** *Si non es baptizatus, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, etc.* **Hac tamen conditionali forma non passim aut leviter uti licet, sed prudenter; et ubi, re diligenter pervestigata, probabilis subest dubitatio infantem non fuisse baptizatum.**

173. When Baptism is to be administered conditionally, the condition should be expressed, as is here directed. According to Natalis Alexander,[2] Baptism was not administered conditionally before the eighth century; but Benedict XIV. refutes this opinion, and shows that the use of conditional baptism was frequent from the very beginning, though the condition was only implied in the intention, and not expressed in words, previous to the

[1] *In Baptismatis Officium Notæ*, n. 20, page 865.
[2] *Hist. Eccl.*, Sec. iv. cap. iv. art. 12.

eighth century.[1] The conditional form, however, is not to be used unless when, after diligent inquiry, there is a prudent reason for doubting whether the sacrament was validly administered before.

174. The Catechism of the Council of Trent warns pastors against the error of supposing that they are free to baptize conditionally any child that is presented to them. They are strictly bound to inquire whether it has been previously baptized, and if so, to ascertain as well as they can whether the baptism was validly conferred; and it is only when, after this diligent inquiry, a doubt still remains as to the validity, they should proceed to baptize conditionally. If they act otherwise, the use of the conditional form will not save them from being guilty of sin and incurring an irregularity.[2]

§ XI.—Baptismus licet fieri possit aut per infusionem aquæ, aut per immersionem, aut per aspersionem; primus tamen, vel secundus modus, qui magis sunt in usu, pro Ecclesiarum consuetudine retineantur: ita ut trina ablutione caput baptizandi perfundatur, vel immergatur in modum Crucis uno et eodem tempore, quo verba proferantur et idem sit aquam adhibens et verba pronuntians.

175. In the Latin Church Baptism is now generally conferred by effusion (called also infusion, and affusion), *i.e.*, by pouring water on the head in the manner hereafter directed.[3] For many centuries it was much more

[1] *Syn. Dioc.* lib. vii. cap. vi. n. 1.

[2] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 57. Bened. XIV. l. c. n. 3. Vid. St. Lig. lib. vi. n 122.

[3] Infra. chap. iv. § xvii.

commonly conferred by immersion, and it would be difficult to fix the time when baptism by immersion fell into disuse; it was common enough so late as the fourteenth century, as appears from the statutes of several synods mentioned by Martene,[1] and it is still retained as part of the Ambrosian rite at Milan.[2]

176. Immersion has been always in use amongst the Greeks. It is the only mode of Baptism given in the Euchologium,[3] though Goar testifies that very frequently they baptize by effusion.[4] In the Russo-Greek Church, according to the Compendium of Theology above referred to,[5] both modes are in use: "Modus quo baptismus in "nostra Ecclesia peragitur duplex est . . alter immer- "sionis alter ablutionis".[6]

177. It is quite certain that from the very beginning Baptism was frequently conferred by effusion, as *e.g.*, in the case of those who were baptized in sickness, and who were called "Clinici"; and at all events since the thirteenth century this is the ordinary mode of conferring it in the Latin Church.[7]

178. Baptism by aspersion or sprinkling is not in use, but there can be no doubt of its validity; it is the common opinion of theologians that this was the mode used by the Apostles in baptizing the multitude of converts mentioned *Acts*, cap. ii. v. 41. This whole matter is briefly but clearly stated in the Catechism of the Council

[1] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xiv. n. 6.
[2] Ibid., n. 5. Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xviii.
[3] Vid. Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. Ord. xxii. et seq.
[4] *In Baptismatis Officium Notæ*, n. 24. pag. 365.
[5] Supra, n. 172.
[6] Cap. lvii. § 6.
[7] Vid. Perrone, *De Bapt.*, cap. i. prop. ii.

of Trent, which directs the pastor to explain "that by "the common custom and practice of the Church, there "are three ways of administering Baptism—immersion, "effusion, and aspersion; and that administered in any of "these three ways it is valid; for in Baptism water is "used to signify the spiritual ablution which it accom- "plishes, whence Baptism is called by the Apostle, a "'laver' (*Ephes.*, v. 26); but ablution is not more really "accomplished by immersion, which was long in use from "the earliest period of the Church, than by effusion, "which we now see to be the general practice, or asper- "sion, the manner in which there is reason to believe "Peter administered Baptism, when on one day he con- "verted and baptized three thousand persons" (*Acts*, cap. ii. 41).[1]

179. The water is to be poured on the head, or the head is to be immersed three times, each time in the form of a cross.[2] The triple ablution here prescribed is not essential to the sacrament, but it should not be omitted except in case of necessity.[3]

180. The form should be pronounced while the matter is being applied, so that they be physically, or at least morally, united. It has been already stated[4] that strict physical simultaneousness is not essential to the validity, but at least there must be a moral union, otherwise the words of the form would not be verified, nor would the sacrament, consequently, be valid; and for the same

[1] Para. ii. cap. ii. n. 17.
[2] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xvii. et § viii.
[3] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxvi.
[4] Supra, 134.

reason it is essential that the same person apply the water and pronounce the form.[1]

§ XII.—**Ubi vero Baptismus fit per infusionem aquæ, cavendum est ne aqua ex infantis capite in fontem, sed in sacrarium Baptisterii prope ipsum fontem extructum defluat, aut in aliquo vase ad hunc usum parato recepta, in ipsius Baptisterii, vel in Ecclesiæ sacrarium effundatur.**

181. The water which is poured on the head in Baptism should never be permitted to fall back into the font from which it is taken. It should either fall immediately into the sacrarium of the baptistery, or be received in a basin or vessel provided for the purpose, and be afterwards poured into the sacrarium of the baptistery or of the church. The object of the rubric is to preserve the water from impurities, and to prevent the danger of infection.[2]

182. Immediately adjoining the baptismal font, and on the same or a somewhat lower level, so that the head of the infant may be conveniently held over it while the water is being poured on, there should be constructed a "sacrarium", or basin communicating with the earth by means of a pipe. The font itself is sometimes divided into two compartments, one of which communicates with the earth and serves as the sacrarium. This arrangement is very convenient, and has been adopted in most of the fonts recently constructed.[3]

[1] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 119.

[2] Baruff. tit. v. n. 22. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 4. § iv.

[3] Vid. infra, § xxxii.

183. Should Baptism be administered in a church which has no baptismal font,[1] or the font of which has no sacrarium immediately annexed, the water flowing from the head of the child ought to be received in a vessel, as here directed, and afterwards poured into the sacrarium. Should it be administered in a private house, the water ought to be received in like manner, and conveyed to the sacrarium of the baptistery or church; or, if this be found too inconvenient, it may be thrown into the fire, as is directed in the Constitutions of St Edmund of Canterbury.[2] Whether the water used has been blessed or not, it should be disposed of in this way, since it has been used as the matter of the sacrament; and the reason assigned in the Constitutions is simply "*propter* "*reverentiam Baptismi*".

ON THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM.

DE MINISTRO BAPTISMI.

§ XIII.—Legitimus quidem Baptismi minister est Parochus, vel alius Sacerdos a Parocho, vel ab Ordinario loci delegatus sed quoties infans, aut adultus versatur in vitæ periculo, potest sine solemnitate a quocumque baptizari in qualibet lingua, sive Clerico, sive Laico, etiam excommunicato, sive fideli, sive infideli, sive Catholico, sive hæretico, sive viro, sive femina, servata tamen forma et intentione Ecclesiæ.

184. According to the ancient discipline of the Church,

[1] Vid. infra, § xxx.

[2] Apud Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xiv. n. 4.

the solemn administration of Baptism was generally confined to the bishop, who, nevertheless, occasionally committed it to priests and deacons.[1] Since the institution of parishes,[2] however, the priests appointed to the care of them are, by the very fact, commissioned to administer the sacraments, though a reservation was made as to the solemn administration of Baptism on Easter Saturday and the eve of Pentecost; and this reservation is, with respect to the baptism of adults, still continued in many churches.[3] But, if we except this reservation, it is, according to the present discipline, the undoubted right of the parish priest to baptize all who belong to his parish. Any other priest who baptizes one of them without his leave, or the leave of the Ordinary of the diocese, is guilty of mortal sin, the case of necessity of course excepted.[4] The leave, however, need not always be expressed; it is enough that it can be reasonably presumed.[5]

185. In case of necessity, Baptism may be conferred by any human being who has the use of reason, and knows how to apply the matter and form.[6] "And "here truly may we admire the supreme wisdom and "goodness of our Lord, who, this sacrament being neces- "sary for all, as he instituted water as its matter, than "which nothing can be more common, wished also, in "like manner, that no one should be excluded from its

[1] Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § xiii. n. 3 et 4. Martene, cap. i. art. iii. n. 2 et seq.

[2] Vid Supra, n. 101.

[3] Catal. l. c. n. 5. Vid. infra, § xxix. et chap. v. § iii.

[4] St. Lig. lib vi. n. 115. *Not.* iv.

[5] Ibid, *Not.* ii.

[6] St. Lig. n. 113.

"administration".[1] We have already seen[2] what words are essential to the form, but they may be pronounced in any language or dialect. It seems difficult to understand how an infidel or heretic can have the necessary intention of doing what the Church does, but it has been above explained how they can have the intention implicitly.[3]

§ XIV.—**Sed si adsit Sacerdos, Diacono præferatur, Diaconus Subdiacono, Clericus laico, et vir feminæ, nisi puderis gratia deceat feminam potius, quam virum baptizare infantem non omnino edītum, vel nisi melius femina sciret formam et modum baptizandi.**

185. The order here prescribed in the rubric binds *sub gravi*, so far as it prohibits a laic to baptize, if a priest be present and willing to do so; but it is probable, that a departure from it in any other way, when a priest is not present, does not exceed a venial sin.[4]

A deacon can baptize solemnly when he is specially commissioned by the bishop or parish priest; but theologians commonly teach that this commission should not be given unless for very grave reasons, as, *e.g.*, on account of the great number to be baptized while the priest is disabled by sickness, or too much occupied in hearing confessions, preaching, and other pastoral duties, as might easily happen in missions amongst infidels.[5] Without such a commission, a deacon is not permitted to baptize solemnly, even when called on in case of necessity, and would incur an irregularity by doing so.[6] Hence St.

[1] *Cat. Conc. Trid.*, par. ii. cap. ii. n. 24.
[2] Sup. 167.
[3] Supra, n. 138.
[4] St. Lig., n. 117.
[5] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 116.
[6] St. Lig, l. c. *Dub.* 2.

Liguori inclines to the opinion that a laic baptizing in presence of a deacon, would not be guilty of more than a venial sin.[1] It is manifest that, in some cases, such as the rubric mentions below,[2] modesty requires that if possible, no other than a female be the minister, even though a priest were at hand.[3]

§ XV.—**Quapropter curare debet Parochus, ut Fideles, præsertim obstetrices, rectum baptizandi ritum probe teneant et servent.**

186. Pastors are strictly bound to take care that the faithful, and especially midwives, be well instructed in the manner of administering the sacrament. The obligation here mentioned in the rubric has been inculcated by innumerable provincial and diocesan synods.[4] It is enough to cite the words of the Synod of Thurles: "Cum "Baptisma ad salutem necessarium sit, Dei benignitate "factum est ut a quolibet homine valide conferri possit. "Curandum itaque est a Parochis ut singuli fideles, præ- "sertim vero obstetrices, modum et formam illius minis- "trandi norint, ut in casu necessitatis illud ritè con- "ferant".[5]

187. It is important also that no one should be permitted to perform the office of midwife, who does not hold the Catholic doctrine on the necessity of baptism. Nothing short of this will insure sufficient care for the safety of the child in cases of difficult parturition. It is appalling to think of the disregard for infant life avowed

[1] Lib. vi. n. 117. *Dub.* 3. [2] § xviii. [3] Baruff., Tit. vi. n. 16.
[4] Vid. Catal., tit. ii. cap. i. § xiv. n. 2 et 3.
[5] *De Baptismo*, 6°.

and acted on by some practitioners,[1] and it is the undoubted duty of the pastor to prevent, as far as he can, the employment of such persons.[2]

§ XVI.—**Pater aut mater propriam prolem baptizare non debent, præterquam in mortis articulo, quando alius non reperitur qui baptizet; neque tunc ullam contrahunt cognationem, quæ matrimonii usum impediat.**

188. The minister of Baptism, even when conferred privately or in case of necessity, contracts a spiritual relationship with the child and its parents, which is a diriment impediment to marriage with any of them.[3] This is of no practical importance when the minister is in holy orders, unless in the case wherein the relationship should be mentioned in confession;[4] but it is of great importance as regards baptism conferred by a laic, whose subsequent marriage with the child or its parent, would be null, unless a dispensation from the impediment were previously obtained.

189. The present rubric directs that a child should not be baptized by its parent, unless in the case of extreme necessity here mentioned. In any other case, the parent who baptizes is certainly guilty of grievous sin, unless excused by ignorance;[5] but theologians are divided as to whether or no there results any impediment to the

[1] Vid. "The Dublin Review", No. lxxxvii. March, 1858, and No. lxxxix., Sept., 1858, Art. *Obstetric Morality.*

[2] Cfr. Synod. Thurl. *De Baptismo* in fine.

[3] St Lig., lib. vi. n. 149.

[4] Vid. St. Lig., lib. iv. n. 450.

[5] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 150.

use of marriage. The greater number, with St. Thomas, hold that there does, and the rubric here, by excepting the case of necessity, seems to imply the same; but St. Liguori[1] cites many authors in favour of the opposite opinion, to which he himself seems inclined.

190. The same decision is to be given if the husband baptizes the child of his wife by another man, or the the wife the child of her husband by another woman, for the impediment, if contracted at all, is contracted in this case as well as when the child belongs to both.[2]

191. All this, however, proceeds on the supposition that the parties are already married, for, if they be not, there is no doubt that, even in case of necessity, there would result a diriment impediment to their subsequent marriage.[3]

It may be doubted whether in this case the parent is prohibited more than any other laic from conferring baptism. De Lugo discusses the question, whether a father could licitly stand sponsor for his illegitimate child, and he decides it in the affirmative, laying down as a general principle that the prohibition of the canons extends to the children of one's present lawful consort, whether they be the issue of the present marriage or no, but that it does not extend to others, because in the case of no other does any inconvenience result from the spiritual relationship contracted.[4] The same reasoning appears to be perfectly applicable to the case in which

[1] Loc. cit. *Secunda Sententia.*
[2] Vid. Carriere, *De Matrimonio*, n. 695.
[3] Baruft. n. 21. Carriere, n. 697, *Dicitur*, 2°.
[4] *Resp. Mor.*, lib. i. Dub. v. n. 4.

the parent baptizes his or her illegitimate child. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, however, assigns one reason why the parent of a child should not act as sponsor, which seems to hold good even when the child is illegitimate, viz.: "to mark more strongly the great "difference that exists between this spiritual and the "carnal bringing up of youth".[1] At all events the decision of De Lugo could not be acted on, if the father of an illegitimate child were already bound to marry the mother, in virtue of a promise, or in order to repair an injury, as may easily happen.[2] In such a case, to contract the relationship would be to put an obstacle to the fulfilment of his obligation.

ON THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

DE BAPTIZANDIS PARVULIS.

§ XVII.—**Opportune Parochus hortetur eos, ad quos ea cura pertinet, ut natos infantes, sive baptizandos sive baptizatos, quamprimum fieri poterit, ea qua decet Christiana modestia, sine pompæ vanitate deferant ad Ecclesiam, ne illis Sacramentum tantopere necessarium nimium differatur cum periculo salutis, et ut iis, qui ex necessitate privatim baptizati sunt, consuetæ cæremoniæ ritusque suppleantur, omissa forma et ablutione.**

192. The exhortation here recommended as to the time and manner of presenting infants for baptism, might be

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 29.

[2] Vid. St. Lig., lib. iv. n. 641, et seq. Carriere, *De Justitia*, n. 1356 et seq.

conveniently introduced into the instructions before mentioned.[1] Since Baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation,[2] it follows that infants should be baptized; and seeing the many accidents to which they are exposed, and the great number that die in infancy, it is manifestly expedient that their baptism be not long deferred. The rate of infant mortality varies in different countries, and even in the same country is considerably affected by the circumstances of the parents. But it is ascertained from reliable statistics that fully one-third of the infants born alive die before completing their fifth year.[3] In a paper read by Dr. Fraser before the Association for the Promotion of Social Science,[4] it was stated that, in Glasgow, during the month of July, 1860, the mortality of infants under five years, was as high as 55 per cent. And in another paper read by Dr. Gairdner on the same occasion, it was shown as the result of a great number of returns carefully selected, that the mortality *within the first year after birth*, ranges from 15 as the lowest up to nearly 30[5] per cent.[6]

There are good reasons, therefore, why the rubric should prescribe, as it does here, that infants be presented for baptism as soon as possible. Several provincial synods have ordered it within a limited time. St. Charles ordered it before the ninth day, and that too under pain of excommunication.[6] Benedict XIV. ordered the same, and under

[1] Sup. n. 131. [2] Vid. supra 149, et seq.

[3] Vid. Encyclopædia Britannica, 8th edition, art. *Mortality*.

[4] Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science for 1860, p. 648.

[5] Accurately 29,641. [6] Ibid. pag. 632.

[6] *Act Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. i. Concil. Prov. i. *Quæ pertinent ad Bapt. administ.* pag. 7.

the same penalty for Bologna, when he was Archbishop of that city.[1]

193. It is certain that parents, or those who have the charge of infants, are guilty of grievous sin, if they put off their baptism for a long time, unless there be some weighty reason to excuse them. It is difficult to determine what delay would amount to a mortal sin, but the more common and the more probable opinion, according to St. Liguori, requires it to exceed ten or eleven days.[2]

194. Though the infant may have received a private baptism, the rubric directs that it be brought to the church as soon as possible to have the usual ceremonies supplied. To neglect this would be a grievous sin, according to St. Liguori.[3]

When a priest baptizes an infant in a private house, Collet teaches[4] that he should apply all the usual ceremonies, if there be no danger of the infant's death before the sacrament is conferred. But it is certain that even in such circumstances he is not, at least as a general rule, permitted to perform any of the ceremonies which precede Baptism; these must be performed in the church. This is the general law expressed or supposed in the Ritual, and confirmed by several decrees of the Sacred Congregation.[5]

195. In missionary countries, however, where the houses of the faithful are often at a great distance from the church, and where there is reason to fear that the children might not afterwards be brought to the church

[1] *Instit.* xcviii. n. 8.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 144. *in parenth.*
[3] Lib. vi. n. 118, Not. ii.
[4] *De Bapt.* cap. v., Quæres, 3°.
[5] Vid. infra. cap. iv. § xxvi.

to have the ceremonies supplied, it is permitted to the missionaries to administer the sacrament with all the ceremonies in private houses, according to an instruction of Pius VI.[1] In Ireland until recently this custom very generally prevailed, but the Synod of Thurles has abolished it, and decreed that, in future, Baptism be conferred only in the church. The Synod adds, however, by way of exception: "Quod si infantes in periculo mortis "sint aut si longe degunt ab Ecclesiis, ita ut ad eas tuto "ferri non possunt, tunc morem jam inductum necessitas "mutari non sinit".[2] This would certainly seem to allow a priest baptizing in case of necessity in a private house, to follow the old custom of performing all the ceremonies.[3]

§ XVIII.—**Nemo in utero matris clausus baptizari debet. Sed si infans caput emiserit, et periculum mortis immineat, baptizetur in capite; nec postea, si vivus evaserit, erit iterum baptizandus.**

196. An infant is not to be baptized until fully born, unless when there is reason to fear that it may not be born alive. In cases of difficult parturition, therefore, such as are here contemplated, it is important to know when Baptism may be conferred.

It is certain, in the first place, that the infant cannot be baptized if it is still enclosed so that water cannot reach it; but if it can be reached through the enclosure even by means of an instrument, so that water can be poured or sprinkled on it, the baptism would probably be valid,

[1] Cit. apud "Analecta Juris Pontificii", Nov., 1855, pag. 1804.
[2] *De Baptismo*, 7°.
[3] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxvii.

and, therefore, in case of necessity, might be conferred conditionally.[1]

Those who maintain that the baptism in this case would be invalid, rely chiefly on the argument used by St. Augustine against the heretics who maintained that the ablution of the mother's body would suffice for the baptism of the infant in her womb, viz., "that it must be "first *born*, before it can be *born again*". But it is replied that it may be said, in a theological sense, to be "natus" when it is alive in the womb, as in the expression of the Scripture, "*Quod in ea natum est de Spiritu* "*Sancto est*";[2] and it may be added that, in the case supposed, there is incipient parturition. Benedict XIV. discusses the question at great length, and concludes that pastors should instruct midwives in such a case of extreme necessity to administer baptism conditionally.[3]

197. There is no doubt about the validity of the baptism when water is poured on the head. And therefore it should be conferred absolutely in the case here mentioned in the rubric, and should not be repeated, unless when there is reason to fear, as there often is, according to Cardinal Gousset,[4] that the midwife or other person conferring it in such trying circumstances may have omitted something essential, in which case it should, of course, be repeated conditionally. The words of the rubric "**si caput emiserit**", ought to be rigorously verified, because it was decided by the Sacred Congregation of the

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 107.
[2] Matth., cap. i. v. 20.—Vid. St. Lig. n. 107. *Secunda Sententia.*
[3] *Synod. Dioc.* lib. vii. cap. v.
[4] *Theologie Morale*, vol. ii. no. 82.

Council, that if a fœtus in the womb be baptized on the crown or top of the head, baptism should be repeated conditionally after the birth: "Fœtus in utero supra verticem "baptizatus post ortum denuo sub conditione baptizetur".[1]

§ XIX.—**At si aliud membrum emiserit, quod vitalem indicet motum, in illo, si periculum impendeat, baptizetur; et tunc si natus vixerit, erit sub conditione baptizandus eo modo quo supra dictum est: *Si non es baptizatus, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, etc.* Si vero ita baptizatus, deinde mortuus prodierit ex utero, debet in loco sacro sepeliri.**

198. Baptism on any other part than the head is doubtful, and, therefore, it is directed that, if conferred in necessity, it be repeated conditionally, though it is commonly held that baptism on any principal part, as the shoulder or breast, would be valid.[2] The rubric does not say that it is to be conferred conditionally in the first instance, but we believe it should, at least when the water reaches only a hand or foot, or some small part.[3]

199. The conditional baptism conferred in any of these cases gives a right to ecclesiastical sepulture, which as a general rule is conceded, unless when there is a clear and certain ground of exclusion.[4]

§ XX.—**Si mater prægnans mortua fuerit, fœtus quamprimum caute extrahatur, ac, si vivus fuerit, baptizetur: si fuerit mortuus, et baptizari non potuerit, in loco sacro sepeliri non debet.**

200. It is needless to observe that the greatest caution

[1] 12 Julii, 1794, cit apud Falise, *Decreta Authentica Sac. Rit. Cong.*, v. *Baptisma* in nota.

[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 107. Quær. iv. [3] St. Lig., l. c. Quær. iii. in fine.

[4] Cfr. Ferraris, *V. Sepultura*, n. 172, et seq.

is necessary in doing what is here prescribed. There must be a certainty of the mother's death before any incision is attempted, otherwise it is evident there would be a risk of taking away or shortening her life; and this is never lawful, not even to procure the baptism of the infant.[1] But when it is quite certain that she is dead, the fœtus should be extracted without delay, if there be the least hope that it is still alive.

201. It may be useful to dwell a little on this important matter, since priests on the mission are so often obliged to give advice and direction as to what should be done in the distressing case here supposed.

It is evident from the Catholic doctrine regarding the necessity of baptism, that there is a strict obligation of doing all that can be done in the circumstances to give the infant a chance of receiving it.[2] Some writers condemned the Cæsarean operation as useless, maintaining that the infant in the womb must die at the same time with the mother; but this opinion is exploded, and all theologians are agreed in inculcating what is here prescribed in the rubric.[3] Numberless instances prove that the infant may be alive in the womb a considerable time after the mother's death. Bouvier mentions that infants have been taken out alive twenty-four and even forty-eight hours after the death of the mothers.[4]

202. It was formerly believed, that to preserve the

[1] St. Lig, lib. vi. n. 106. *Omnino tenendum.* Gousset, vol. ii. n. 83. Bouvier, *Abrégé D' Embryologie*, Q. v. 2°.

[2] Vid. supra., n. 149. et seq.

[3] Benedict XIV., *De Synod. Dioc.* lib. xi. cap. vii. n. 12.

[4] *Op. cit.* Quest. vii. 2°. Vid. Dublin Review, No. lxxxvii., March, 1858, Art. *Obstetric Morality*, pag. 127.

infant's life, the mouth of the deceased should be kept open till the operation has been performed, and a recommendation to this effect is found in most authors.[1] But it has been ascertained, according to Bouvier,[2] that this is quite useless, and that the only thing necessary is, to prevent, if possible, the cold which follows death from reaching the infant. This is best effected by applying warm cloths to the part where the infant is; and care should be taken to do so, if it be necessary to wait some time for a person to perform the operation.

203. The operation should be performed by a surgeon, if one can be had. In defect of a surgeon, it should be performed by the nurse in attendance or some other female. If there be no one else, it may be performed by a man, but in no case, according to Bouvier, should it be attempted by a priest, above all by a young priest.[3] At least, according to Cardinal Gousset,[4] the priest is not bound to perform it, even if there be no one else.

The exception as regards the priest, is not made by any other author that we have seen. Dens[5] expressly says, that in defect of any other to perform it, "incum-"bit parocho eandem operationem facere". Debreyne[6] is of the same opinion, and says this is the opinion of the older theologians. He observes that Bouvier himself, in the earlier editions of his book, excepted the case in which it would be impossible to get another to do it. No doubt, such an operation is extremely unsuited to the

[1] St. Lig. l. c. Lacroix, lib vi. pars. i. n. 293, etc.
[2] *Op cit.* Q. vi. 2 .
[3] *Op. cit.*, Q. viii.
[4] Vol. ii. n. 83.
[5] *De Baptismo*, n. 24.
[6] *Traité Pratique D' Embryologie Sacrée*, chap. § ii. iii.

priestly character; but if we suppose a case in which there is good reason to believe that the infant is alive in the body of the deceased mother, while there is no one but the priest to perform the operation, it is hard to see why he might not, and should not, perform it if he can, since the eternal salvation of the infant is here at stake.

204. At all events it is certain that the pastor is bound to instruct, with regard to this obligation, those of his flock whom it may concern, as mothers, nurses, surgeons, and such as are employed in any way about women at the time of their confinement. His own prudence must direct him as to the time and circumstances in which the instructions may be given [1]

205. He should take care also, that those who might be required to perform the operation, in defect of a surgeon, be instructed as to the manner of performing it. For the instruction of such persons Bouvier gives the following directions. 1° The incision should be made on the side that appears most prominent, lengthwise, and not across. It may be made with a razor when there is no surgical instrument. 2° It should be about six or seven inches long. The flesh having been cut through, and the entrails that may be met with set aside, the matrix must be opened very gently, so as not to hurt the infant. When the matrix is sufficiently opened, conditional baptism should be administered with tepid water, lest the infant might die on exposure to the air. It should then be taken out, and when the membrane which

[1] Vid. Bouvier, *Op. cit.* Qu. vii. n. 1, 2. St. Lig., n. 106. *Hic operæ pretium.*

envelopes it is removed, it should be again baptized conditionally.[1]

206. If baptism has not been administered before extraction, and if the fœtus when extracted be alive, it should be baptized absolutely. In case of doubt, if it shows the least sign of life, however equivocal, it should be baptized conditionally "*Si vivis*", etc.[2] But if it be certainly dead, baptism should not be attempted, nor should it be buried in consecrated ground, as is plain from the present rubric. If it be found dead in the womb, however, it should not be removed but be buried with the mother.[3]

207. We may here observe that the Cæsarean operation has been often successfully performed on the living subject in France and other countries of the continent. Several instances are related by Clericatus,[4] and the statistics of modern practice show that the operation was successful in more than two-thirds of the cases in which it was performed, though these included many in which it was not tried until the life of the patient was almost despaired of.[5] In this way the lives of both mother and child are often saved, when otherwise both must have been lost, or one sacrificed to preserve the other.

208. If we suppose a case, then, in which there is an experienced surgeon prepared to undertake the operation, while it is certain, 1° that the danger to the mother's life is not increased by it, and 2° that it is the best, if not the

[1] Bouvier, *Op. cit.* Qu. ix. [2] St. Lig., n. 124.
[3] Bouvier, Qu. ix. 4°.
[4] *De Baptismo* Decis. xli. n. 5 et. seq.
[5] Vid. Dublin Review, March, 1858. No. lxxxvii. pag. 117.

only chance of extracting the infant alive; the mother would be plainly bound, in charity to her infant, to submit to it. Bouvier says she should be earnestly exhorted to do so, but not compelled under pain of being refused the sacraments.[1] Better leave her *in bona fide*. At all events in practice it can hardly occur that all the conditions are so certainly placed as to leave no doubt about her obligation.[2]

209. The operation is comparatively rare either in these countries or in America. The reason is one which shows what little account is generally made of Christian faith and morality in certain surgical schools. It is, that practitioners are commonly taught to have recourse to another operation, by which the infant is ruthlessly destroyed in order to save the mother, or even, perhaps, to spare her extraordinary pain.[3] With us, therefore, a surgeon can hardly be found willing to attempt the Cæsarean section while the mother is living, and consequently with us a priest can hardly be called on to deal with the case above mentioned.

210. But he is called on, and is bound to do all he can, to prevent any operation which directly tends to destroy the infant's life. Such an operation is never lawful, unless it be ascertained beyond doubt that the infant is already dead in the womb. If surgical skill can supply no other remedy, the case must be left to the efforts of nature and to Providence. If in these circumstances the

[1] *Op. cit.*, Qu. v. n. 3.

[2] Bouvier, l. c. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 84. Vid. St. Lig., n. 106. *circa medium*. Gury, vol. ii. n. 259.

[3] Vid. Dublin Review, No. lxxxvii. Art. *Obstetric Morality*.

mother dies, the Cæsarean operation should be performed after death, and baptism administered to the fœtus, according to what has been said above.

211. The same rule, as regards baptism, is to be followed in case of abortion, no matter how early the stage of pregnancy. It is now the common opinion that the fœtus is animated from the moment of conception, or a few days after, and the rule generally received is, in every case of abortion to baptize the fœtus, absolutely if it shows evident signs of life, conditionally if there is reasonable ground for doubting whether it be alive or not.[1] The Congregation of the Holy Office, in reference to cases proposed in this matter, gave the following decision: "In casibus propositis (nempe de baptismo fœtûs abor-"tivi) si suppetat rationabile fundamentum dubitandi, "an fœtus ille sit animatus animâ rationali, tunc potest "et debet baptizari sub conditione: si vero non suppetat "rationabile fundamentum, nullatenus potest baptizari.

"Ad videndum autem an sit rationabile fundamentum "talis dubii, consulendi sunt Medici et Theologi in facti "contingentiâ, sive in casibus particularibus".[2] It is not to be baptized, for instance, if it does not present even the first lineaments of a human body, for all are agreed: "Non debere baptizari carneam massam quæ nullam "habeat organorum dispositionem".[3]

Jerome Florentinius, who was the first to write a formal dissertation on the subject,[4] maintained that, on account

[1] St. Lig., n. 124. Bouvier, *Abrégé D'Embryologie*, Quaest. i. n. 3°.

[2] Die. 5. Aprilis, An. 1715. The decision, in the words cited, was sent, not long ago, in answer to a priest who had made application to Rome on the subject. [3] St. Lig., l. c.

[4] *Disputatio de ministrando Baptismo Humanis fœtibus abortivis,*

of the doubt about the time of animation, conditional baptism should be administered to the fœtus in case of abortion, no matter how soon after conception it may take place. This dissertation was received with great applause in all the schools of theology.[1] But the author was directed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index, to limit his proposition to fœtus, . . . "in quibus apparent prima vitæ humanæ delineamenta",[2] and he accordingly declares in the commencement of his dissertation that such is his meaning. He further adds (by direction, as it would seem, of the same authority), that he has no intention of binding others under pain of sin to adopt his opinion in practice, nor of introducing any new rite: "Deinde "adverto me neminem, quoad praxim attinet, sub mor- "tali obligare, sed tantum rationes speculative id suaden- "tes exponere, ac in suspenso relinquere, sicuti nec indu- "cere novum aliquem ritum in Ecclesiam; cum id ad Sac. "Rit. Congregationem, Summumque Pontificem spectet".[3]

Cangiamila, in his *Embryologia Sacra*, adopting the view of Florentinius, gives minute instructions as to the manner of administering baptism in the various cases that may occur. This work, which is commended by Benedict XIV.,[4] has supplied nearly all that is found in subsequent writers on the subject.[5]

given *in extenso*, by the "Analecta Juris Pontificii", VI^eme^ Serie, pag. 1280 et seq., Rome, 1863.

[1] Vid. "Analecta". V^eme^ Serie *Sacrement De Baptême*, chap. v. pag. 1112 et seq.

[2] "Analecta", l. c. pag. 1138.

[3] *Disput. cit.* apud "Analecta", pag. 1280.

[4] *De Synodo Dioc.*, lib. xi. cap. vii. n. 13.

[5] Vid. *Dissert. Theolog. De Baptizandis Abortivis* apud Dens, in Appendice ad *Tractatum De Baptismo*. Edit. Mechliniæ, 1830.

212. If the fœtus be enveloped in the secundines, it should be baptized in this state conditionally "Si tu es "capax", etc., for on the one hand, such a baptism is probably valid,[1] and on the other, there is danger of instant death from exposure to the air on the membrane being opened.[2] The baptism thus conferred being doubtful, the fœtus should be again baptized conditionally when the membrane is opened.[3] Bouvier[4] observes that the fœtus, though alive, may be so feeble as to be unable to bear the application of cold water, and in this case tepid water, if at hand, should be used. Again, it may be so small that it cannot be baptized in the usual way, and in this case he recommends that it be baptized by immersion; but care must be taken as far as possible that nothing be done which would tend to deprive it of life. It cannot live long, it is true, but it would be unlawful to do anything that would directly hasten its death.[5]

213. Since 1831 the practice has been introduced in France, of causing the child to be born prematurely when it is foreseen that it cannot be born alive at the end o the natural term. This method has been found very su cessful in saving the lives of both mother and child, wh the birth is not caused till after the seventh month. A it is not only lawful but highly laudable to have recou to it, when it is already known from experience that child, if full-sized, cannot be brought forth alive.[6]

[1] Benedict XIV., *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. v. n. iii.
[2] Bouvier, *Op. cit.* Qu. ii. n. 2°.
[3] Bouvier, l. c. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 85.
[4] Loc. cit.. n. 3. and 4 .
[5] Bouvier, l. c.
[6] Bouvier, Qu. v. n. 3°. Dublin Review, loc. cit. p. 118.

§ XXI.—**Infantes expositi et inventi, si, re diligenter investigata, de eorum Baptismo non constet, sub conditione baptizentur.**

214. The priest is strictly bound to make diligent inquiry about the baptism of such children as are here mentioned;[1] and they are to be baptized conditionally, unless there be satisfactory proof that they have been already validly baptized. The same rule is to be observed with regard to infants baptized in case of necessity by midwives or other laics; the doubt, if after proper inquiry any still remains, being always resolved in practice by conferring conditional baptism.[2]

215. If the children of non-Catholic parents be presented to a priest for Baptism, with the consent of one of the parents, they should, by all means, be baptized when there is a hope that they shall be educated as Catholics, care being taken to have a Catholic sponsor. But if such children be in probable danger of death, they should be baptized without any hesitation.[3] Of course the Baptism should be conferred *sub conditione* when there is a doubt whether the child was validly baptized before.

§ XXII.—**In monstris vero baptizandis, si casus eveniat, magna cautio adhibenda est, de quo, si opus fuerit, Ordinarius loci, vel alii periti consulantur, nisi mortis periculum immineat.**

Monstrum, quod humanam speciem non prse se ferat, baptizari non debet; de quo si dubium fuerit, baptizetur sub hac conditione: *Si tu es homo, ego te baptizo, etc.*

[1] Vid. supra, n. 174.

[2] St. Lig. n. 135, 136. Syn. Thurl. *De Bapt.* no. 11.

[3] Syn. Thur. l. c. n. 9°.

216. With respect to this rubric we cannot do better than cite what St. Liguori says:[1] "Quando dubitatur "an monstrum sit homo, baptizandum absolute, si caput "sit humanum, licet membra sint ferina; sub conditione "vero, si caput sit ferinum, et membra humana; hoc vero si "prodierit ex congressu viri cum fœmina; nam si prodierit "ex viro cum bestia (quod incredibile puto) tunc baptizari "semper deberet sub conditione; secus si ex fœmina et "bruto, tunc enim nullo modo baptizandum, quia non "descenderet ex Adam, utpote non conceptum ex semine "virili". Debreyne[2] denies the possibility of procreation such as is supposed here, and lays down as the rule to be observed in practice, that the issue of a woman, no matter what shape or appearance it presents, may be baptized conditionally.

§ XXIII.—**Illud vero, de quo dubium est, una ne aut plures sint personæ, non baptizetur, donec id discernatur: discerni autem potest, si habeat unum vel plura capita, unum vel plura pectora; tunc enim totidem erunt corda et animæ, hominesque distincti, et eo casu singuli seorsum sunt baptizandi, uniculque dicendo:** *Ego te baptizo, etc.* **Si vero periculum mortis immineat, tempusque non suppetat ut singuli separatim baptizentur, poterit Minister, singulorum capitibus aquam infundens, omnes simul baptizare, dicendo:** *Ego vos baptizo in Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* **Quam tamen formam in iis solum, et in aliis similibus mortis periculis ad plures simul baptizandos, et ubi tempus non patitur ut singuli separatim baptizentur, alias nunquam licet adhibere.**

Quando vero non est certum in monstro esse duas

[1] Lib. vi. n. 125.

[2] *Traité Pratique D'Embryologie Sacrée*, chap. ii. § vii.

personas, quia duo capita et duo pectora non habet distincta; tunc debet primum unus absolute baptizari, et postea alter sub conditione, hoc modo: *Si non es baptizatus, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*

217. The rubric here requires no explanation. The rules it lays down for forming the judgment, and the instructions it gives as to what should be done in the several cases, are very clear and precise, in so much that St. Liguori[1] is satisfied with quoting the words.

ON THE SPONSORS.

DE PATRINIS.

§ XXIV.—**Parochus, antequam ad baptizandum accedat, ab iis, ad quos spectat, exquirat diligenter, quem, vel quos Susceptores seu Patrinos elegerint, qui infantem de sacro Fonte suscipiant, ne plures quam liceat, aut indignos, aut ineptos admittat.**

218. It has been the practice in the Church from the very earliest times, to have certain persons assisting at the solemn administration of baptism, to answer for the infant, making profession of the Christian faith in its name, and to receive it from the hands of the minister when baptized at the sacred font. They assisted in like manner at the baptism of adults, except that the adults themselves were required to answer the interrogations. Hence they were called "Sponsores", "Fidejussores",

[1] Loc. cit. in fine.

"Susceptores", and sometimes also "Offerentes".[1] They are mentioned by Tertullian, *Lib. de Bapt.*, cap. xviii., St. Basil, *Epist.* 128, and in several places by St. Augustine.[2]

In later times they have been usually called "Patrini", since they undertake the office of spiritual parents towards those for whom they are sponsors at the sacred font. In English they are called "God-fathers" and "God-mothers" as well as Sponsors; and very commonly amongst the humbler classes, "Gossips", which is the old Saxon name by which they were designated.[3]

219. "Let all sponsors, then", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "at all times recollect that they "are bound principally to exercise a constant vigilance "over their spiritual children, and to take particular care "that in those things that belong to the formation of "a Christian life, they approve themselves throughout life "such as their sponsors promised they should be by the "solemn ceremony".[4]

It is not surprising, therefore, that the pastor is here directed to make diligent inquiry regarding the person or persons selected as sponsors, and to admit no one who is not duly qualified. He ought to make this inquiry before he commences the ceremony, as he would then have less difficulty in setting aside one whom he might ascertain to be unfit. The inquiry should be made of the parents, who have the right of selecting the sponsors.

[1] Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xvi. n. 11, 12. [2] Citat. apud Martene, l. c.

[3] Worcester's Dictionary, v. *Gossip*.

[4] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 28.

The priest cannot refuse to admit those who are designated, if they are duly qualified; but should he refuse, and appoint others, his act, though sinful, would be valid.[1] If he be careful to instruct the faithful, as he is required to do by the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[2] on the duties and qualifications of sponsors, it will rarely happen that any one is presented as sponsor whom he will find it necessary to reject.

§ XXV.—**Patrinus unus tantum, sive vir, sive mulier, vel ad summum unus et una adhibeantur, ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini; sed simul non admittantur duo viri, aut duæ mulieres, neque baptizandi pater aut mater.**

220. According to the decree of the Council of Trent, only one, or at most two, a male and a female, should be admitted to act as sponsors;[3] and St. Liguori[4] teaches that the pastor would be guilty of grievous sin if he admits a greater number. The object of the decree is to prevent a too great extension of the impediment arising from the spiritual relationship contracted by the sponsors with the infant and its parents.[5] If a greater number, however, be selected, the priest may permit them to be present and even to touch the child, provided he designates two who are to be the real sponsors, and gives notice that they alone contract the spiritual relationship.[6]

221. But if, notwithstanding the decree, a greater number be simply admitted to act as sponsors, it is a

[1] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 146.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Sess. xxiv. *De Reform. Matrim.*, cap. ii.
[4] Lib. vi. n. 154. in fine.
[5] St. Lig., loc. cit. Carriere, *De Matrimonio*, n. 692.
[6] St. Lig. l. c.

question amongst theologians, whether all contract the relationship. St. Liguori[1] resolves it thus. If all be designated, and if they touch the child *successively*, only the first two contract the relationship; but if they touch it *simultaneously*, all contract it. If none be designated, all who touch contract it. Because, according to him, the decree of Trent implies: 1° that no more than two should be designated; and 2° that in case two thus designated shall act, no others who after them may touch the child shall in any circumstances contract the relationship, but it does not abrogate the provisions of the ancient canons with regard to other cases.

222. When there are two sponsors, they should be of different sexes, according to the rubric—not two males, nor two females. There is a certain congruity in this, from the analogy between the spiritual and natural parentage, as is explained by St. Thomas.[2] A violation of the rubric would be a grievous sin, according to St. Liguori, if the sponsors admitted be of a different sex from that of the child; but it would not exceed a venial sin if they be of the same sex.[3] By a constitution of Urban II., a husband and wife were prohibited from acting together as sponsors, but this constitution is no longer in force, and they are now freely admitted.[4]

When there is only one sponsor, it is usual to select one of the same sex with the child; but there is no obligation, since the words of the rubric, taken from the decree of Trent, leave the choice free.[5]

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 154.
[2] 3 Part. Quæs. lxvii. art. vii.
[3] St. Lig. n. 155. Dub. 2.
[4] St. Lig. n. 157.
[5] St. Lig. n. 155. Dub. 1.

223. The father or mother is prohibited from acting as sponsor; and this, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "to mark more strongly the great "difference that exists between the spiritual and the "carnal bringing up of youth".[1] But if either *does* act as sponsor, would there arise an impediment to the use of marriage? Most theologians affirm that there would, and assign this as a reason for the prohibition here mentioned in the rubric. St. Liguori,[2] however, seems inclined to the opposite opinion, for he includes this case and that in which the parent baptizes, under the same question; and although, in the discussion, he seems to speak only of the case in which the parent baptizes, he manifestly supposes the decision to apply equally to both cases, especially since the canon, *Si vir* 2. *de cognat. spirit.*, which is quoted by him, and, indeed, by all theologians and canonists, in treating the question, regards precisely the case of a parent being sponsor.[3]

§ XXVI.—**Hos autem Patrinos saltem in ætate pubertatis, ac Sacramento Confirmationis consignatos esse, maxime convenit.**

224. From the duties attached to the office of sponsor, it is fitting that those who undertake it be not mere children, but have attained the age of puberty, which is, according to the canons, fourteen years complete for males, and twelve for females;[4] and also that they have received the sacrament of confirmation. In the fifth provincial Council of Milan, under St. Charles, parish priests are

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 29.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 150.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 189.
[4] Cfr. Carriere, *De Mat.* n. 901.

ordered to require these conditions.[1] The words of the rubric "**maxime conveniⁱ**", do not, however, imply a strict obligation, and theologians generally are satisfied with requiring that the person acting as sponsor should have been baptized, and have attained the use of reason, being at least seven years old.[2] At all events there need be no great difficulty in admitting one sponsor under the age of puberty, with another who has attained it.[3]

225. We must, of course, except places where the provisions of the rubric are enforced by a special law, as would seem to be the case in England, for the Synod of Westminster has the following decree: "Non admittantur "patrini vel matrinæ qui non sint Catholici vel qui a jure "excluduntur; nimirum, impuberes, excommunicati ma- "jori excommunicatione, nondum confirmati, qui paschalis "communionis præceptum non adimplent; demum eccle- "siastici. Curet sacerdos ut, propter periculum fidei infan- "tium facile obventurum post mortem parentum, ambo, "quoties fieri possit, adhibeantur".[4]

226. To act as sponsor validly, and thereby contract the spiritual relationship, it is necessary, 1° that the person be designated, or at least in some way admitted to act as such;[5] 2° that he have the intention of so acting; 3° that by himself or his procurator (for he can depute another to act in his name),[6] he hold up or physically touch the child while it is being baptized, or imme-

[1] *Act. Eccl. Medol.*, pars. i. concil. prov. v. *Quæ ad Baptismum pertinent*, pag. 178.

[2] St. Lig., n. 146. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 111.

[3] Cfr. Bouvier, *De Bapt.*, cap. vii. art. i.

[4] *Acta et Decreta Primi Concil. Provinc. Westmon.*, De Baptismo, n. 5.

[5] Vid. supra, n. 221.

[6] St. Lig. n. 153.

diately receive it from the hands of the priest. 4° that the baptism be conferred solemnly.[1]

227. According to St. Ligouri, sponsors may be admitted in private baptism, and he would even prefer to to have them. "præsentia adhiberi".[2] Falise says they should not be admitted, because the ritual makes no mention of them in what it has regarding baptism in necessity.[4] The Sacred Congregation of the Council has declared, according to Ferraris, that "pro baptismo privato suscep-"tores Ecclesia non instituit": but Ferraris himself infers nothing more from the declaration than that it is no sin to confer private baptism without a sponsor.[3] Bouvier says merely "In baptismo privato non adhibetur patri-"nus nec matrina".[6] There is no decision then, nor any sufficient authority, as far as we know, to make it clear that sponsors *should not* be admitted in private baptism; but at least it is certain that they are not required, and that if admitted they contract no relationship.

228. They are required, however, when the ceremonies are supplied in the church; for the "Ordo supplendi", etc., plainly supposes them to be present;[7] and although they contract no impediment,[8] it is more probable, according to Bouvier,[9] that they are bound to look after the Christian education of the child. The Ritual of Toulon has a formal admonition to this effect in the "Ordo "supplendi", etc.[10]

[1] St. Lig. n. 148. [2] St. Lig. n. 149. [3] St. Lig., n. 147.
[4] *Cours Abregé*, etc., 3me part. sec. i. chap. i. § v. n. 5.
[5] Verb. *Baptismus*, art. vii. n. 7. edition Migne.
[6] *De Bapt.*, cap. vii. art. 1. 2° nfra, chap. vii. § ii.
[7] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxix. [9] Loc. cit. 5°.
[10] Tit. ii. § iv. in fine.

§ XXVII.—**Sciant præterea Parochi ad hoc munus non esse admittendos infideles, aut hæreticos, non publice excommunicatos, aut interdictos, non publice criminosos, aut infames, nec præterea qui sana mente non sunt, nec qui ignorant rudimenta Fidei. Hæc enim Patrini spirituales filios suos, quos de Baptismi fonte susceperint, ubi opus fuerit, opportune docere tenentur.**

229. From what has been already said regarding the duties and obligations that belong to the office of sponsor,[1] it is easy to see that those here mentioned in the rubric are unfit to be intrusted with it, and therefore cannot be lawfully admitted to it. The Priest should ascertain whether those presented have a sufficient knowledge of the Christian doctrine; and with this view it is often expedient to ask them a few questions from the catechism. There is no doubt that sponsors are bound to give a Christian education to their spiritual children, as is here stated in the Ritual, and as is more fully explained in the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[2] which cites the words of St. Augustine on the subject. "'They "'ought', says he, 'to admonish them to observe chastity, "'love justice, cherish charity; and above all, they "'should teach them the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the "'Ten Commandments, and the first rudiments of the "'Christian religion'. *Serm.* 163, *De Temp.* Hence", the Catechism adds,[3] "it is not difficult to decide who "are inadmissible to this holy guardianship: to those "who are unwilling to discharge its duties with fidelity,

[1] Supra, 219.
[2] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 28.
[3] Loc. cit., n. 29.

"or who cannot do so with care and accuracy, this sacred "trust should not be confided".

230. Theologians, however, commonly teach, with St. Thomas,[1] that sponsors are bound to fulfil these duties only when there is reason to think that they are neglected by the parents or others on whom they naturally devolve in the first instance; and hence, generally speaking, sponsors need have no anxiety about the discharge of these duties towards the children of Christian parents.[2]

231. We may observe that an infidel, in the strict sense—that is, one who is unbaptized—cannot act validly as sponsor; at least he does not contract the spiritual relationship which is a matrimonial impediment,[3] and the same is to be said of one whose mind is unsound, or who is incapable of a human act;[4] but the others here mentioned could act validly, though it is unlawful to admit them.

232. In mixed communities, where Catholics and Protestants live together and often even intermarry, a Protestant is sometimes selected to act as sponsor, and this is a cause of great embarrassment to the priest. He cannot, however, in any circumstances, admit one who is not a Catholic. Layman and one or two others, speaking of Germany, hold that he might, in cases where the refusal would give very great offence, but in this they are opposed to the common opinion of theologians.[5]

In such circumstances the priest might appoint a Catholic sponsor who would really act as such, and permit

[1] 3 Par. Quæs. lxvii. art. viii.
[2] St. Lig., n. 147.
[3] Carriere, *De Mat.*, n. 680.
[4] Ibid., n. 688.
[5] Vid. St. Lig. n. 156. Lacroix, lib. vi. p. i, n. 373.

the Protestant to be present merely as a witness, taking care to note this in the registry; or he may omit in the ceremony whatever regards the sponsor, and have none at all.[1] Better, according to Dens,[2] to baptize solemnly without a sponsor, than admit a heretic to act as such; and Bouvier would apply the same rule to all who are clearly excluded by the rubric.[3] If the priest has been careful to inquire beforehand and ascertain who are to be presented as sponsors, he will probably find some pretext for setting aside those who are unfit, without giving any offence.

§ XXVIII.—**Præterea ad hoc etiam admitti non debent Monachi, vel Sanctimoniales, neque alii cujusvis Ordinis Regulares a sæculo segregati.**

233 The secular clergy are not excluded from the office of sponsor by this rubric, but they have been sometimes excluded by diocesan or provincial statutes, as *e.g.* that of Milan, cited by Catalani,[4] and that of the Synod of Westminster above cited.[5] Some have doubted whether the priest who baptizes could at the same time act as sponsor, since he should thus respond to the interrogations put by himself, etc. It is very probable, however, that he can do so by substituting another to give the responses and act in his place.[6] Even this substitution is unnecessary when there is a godmother, for she can answer the interrogations.[7]

[1] Lacroix, l. c. [2] *De Baptismo*, n. 42 in fine.
[3] *De Bapt.*, cap. vii. art. i, n. 2°. [4] Tit. ii. cap. i, § xxvii. n. ii.
[5] Supra, n. 225. [6] Lacroix, l. c. n. 353.
[7] Vid. Revue Theologique, IV^me^ Serie 5° Cahier. Julliet 1860, pag. 404.

234. It is certain that a sponsor can act by means of a proxy, and in this case, the principal, and not the proxy, contracts the relationship, according to a decision of the Sacred Congregation.[1]

THE TIME AND PLACE OF ADMINISTERING BAPTISM.

DE TEMPORE ET LOCO ADMINISTRANDI BAPTISMUM.

§ XXIX.—**Quamvis Baptismus quovis tempore, etiam interdicti et cessationis a Divinis, præsertim si urgeat necessitas, conferri possit; tamen duo potissimum ex antiquissimo Ecclesiæ ritu sacri sunt dies, in quibus solemni cæremonia hoc Sacramentum administrari maxime convenit; nempe Sabbatum Sanctum Paschæ, et Sabbatum Pentecostes, quibus diebus Baptismalis Fontis aqua rite consecratur. Quem ritum, quatenus fieri commode potest, in adultis baptizandis, nisi vitæ periculum immineat, retineri decet, aut certe non omnino prætermitti, præcipue in Metropolitanis, aut Cathedralibus Ecclesiis.**

235. According to the discipline of the Church in the first ages, the solemn administration of baptism took place only twice a year, being confined to the vigils of Easter and Pentecost. Martene proves this by the testimony of the most ancient writers, and decrees of early popes.[2] In the Greek Church the feast of the Epiphany was added, at least as early as the fourth century.[3] In Ireland also the decree of the synod of St. Patrick regarding the time of baptism, mentions the Epiphany as well as Easter and

[1] Vid. St. Lig. n. 153. Carriere, *De Matrimonio*, n. 694.
[2] *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. i.
[3] Ibid., n. iv.

Pentecost: "Octavo die catechumeni sunt, postea solem-"nitatibus Domini baptizantur, id est, Pascha et Pente-"coste et Epiphania".[1] In Gaul, at the close of the sixth century, there were already five days fixed on for the purpose, the feasts of the Nativity of our Lord and of St. John the Baptist, having been added to the three already mentioned;[2] and in some parts of Spain, at a still earlier period, baptism was conferred not only on these feasts, but on all feasts of apostles and martyrs.[3]

236. In case of necessity, however, or when there was reason, from any cause, to apprehend that a catechumen could not be baptized on one of the appointed days, it was conferred without hesitation on any day. As the number of adults to be baptized diminished, and that of infants increased with the gradual establishment of Christianity in each country, the discipline restricting baptism to particular solemnities was gradually relaxed on account of the danger in case of infants, until it altogether ceased. Certain it is, at all events, that it had ceased almost every where about the close of the tenth, or beginning of the eleventh century. In one of the canons enacted in the reign of King Edgar, priests were directed to administer baptism whenever they were called on, and to admonish the faithful that the baptism of infants should not be deferred beyond thirty-seven days at most.[4] What is required by the present discipline and practice throughout the Church has been above stated.[5]

[1] Synod. Sti. Patricii, cap. xix. *Qua ætate baptizandi sunt*, apud Wilkins. *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, vol. i. pag. 5. Londini MDCCXXXVII. [2] Martene, loc. cit. n. vii.

[3] Ibid., n. x. [4] Martene, l. c. n. xv. [5] Supra, n. 193.

237. Some vestiges of the ancient usage still remain in the benediction of the font and other ceremonies prescribed for the vigils of Easter and Pentecost. "On "these vigils alone", says the Catechism of the Council of "Trent,[1] "except in cases of necessity, it was also the "practice of the ancient Church to administer baptism. "But although, on account of the danger to which com- "mon life is exposed, the Church has deemed it expedient "not to continue this custom, she has still most religiously "observed the solemn days of Easter and Pentecost, as "those on which the baptismal water is to be consecrated". She wishes also to give a fuller significance to the ceremonies and prayers by the administration of solemn baptism on these days. In the canon of the mass on these festivals, there are words which refer to those who are supposed to be recently baptized, and the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" even prescribes[2] that no infant be baptized in the church for eight days before, except in case of necessity. This provision of the "Cæremoniale", however, according to a recent annotator,[3] is not attended to even in Rome, on account of the danger in case of infants. But it certainly is the wish of the Church, as the present rubric shows, that, at least in cathedrals, if at all convenient, adults should be presented for baptism on these vigils. Hence in Rome there are always some adult converts in readiness for these occasions,[4] and the same is the case in many other cities, the bishops reserving for this purpose

[1] Para. ii. cap. ii. n. 61.
[2] Lib. ii. cap. xxvii. n. 18.
[3] *Cérémonial Des Evêques Expliqué*, in loc. cit., *note* (2).
[4] Cfr. Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § xxix. n. 1.

the baptism of those adults that may be preparing at the time.[1]

§ XXX.—**Ac licet, urgente necessitate, ubique baptizare nihil impediat; tamen proprius Baptismi administrandi locus est Ecclesia, in qua sit Fons Baptismalis, vel certe Baptisterium prope Ecclesiam.**

238. In the first ages, when the Christians had no churches, baptism was administered wherever a supply of water could be found. After the time of Constantine, its administration came gradually to be restricted to the churches and baptisteries; and this usage was adopted and every where enforced by the canons, so that baptism could not be lawfully administered elsewhere, except in case of necessity.[2] The rubrics of the ritual are in exact conformity with the ancient canons;[3] and many provincial synods recently celebrated, have taken measures to carry out what is thus prescribed, as far as circumstances permit. It is sufficient to refer to the Synod of Thurles,[4] the Synod of Westminster,[5] and the Synod of Baltimore.[6] "Meminerint parochi", says the Synod of Thurles, "Rituale Romanum et Ecclesiæ consuetu-"dinem exigere ut aqua in Baptismo adhibenda, infuso "Oleo et Chrismate benedicatur, vel Sabbato Sancto, vel "Sabbato Pentecostis, vel, si necessitas exigat, alio tem-"pore ante Baptismi administrationem. Caveant itaque

[1] Vid. Cavalieri, tom. iv. cap. xxii. *De Fonte Baptismali*, in Decr. iv. n. iv.

[2] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. ii. Catal. § xxx. n. 7.

[3] Catal. loc. cit.

[4] *De Baptismo*, n. 7 et 8.

[5] Decr. xvi. *De Baptismo*, n. 1° et 4°.

[6] Provin. 1ma. Decr. xvi.

"ut quam primum fontes baptismales in Ecclesiis Pa-"rochialibus erigantur et custodiantur, apud quos Bap-"tismus conferatur, et omnia quæ ad hujus sacramenti "administrationem in Rituali Romano præscribuntur, "accurate serventur".[1] We shall have occasion to treat of the baptismal water, and the manner of blessing it, with the infusion of oil and chrism, hereafter.[2] The synod orders a baptismal font to be constructed in every parochial church, and the Synod of Westminster orders the same for every church, "cui annexa est cura animarum".[3]

239. Baptismal fonts were first constructed in turret-shaped buildings, called baptisteries, apart from, but contiguous to, the churches. These baptisteries were, in some instances, very spacious, and contained several fonts, some for men, and others for women, being provided also with altars, at which the divine mysteries were celebrated, and the newly-baptized received the holy communion.[4] Many of these buildings are still to be seen in Italy. From about the sixth century, however, fonts were commonly constructed within the principal churches, being placed near the entrance on the left, in chapels which are usually called baptisteries, as well as the buildings just mentioned.[5] They were mostly confined to the cathedrals, in which the bishops themselves baptized, and immediately afterwards confirmed the neophytes; and in some cities to the present day, they are restricted to two or three churches, to which all must be

[1] Loc. cit. n. 8°. [2] Infra, chap. ix.
[3] Loc. cit. n. 1. [4] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. ii. n. vi. et seq.
[5] Vid. Revue Théologique, I^re^ serié. 4^me^ Cahier, Nov. 1856, pag. 550.

brought for baptism.[1] Benedict XIV., when Archbishop of Bologna, insisted on the immemorial right of his metropolitan church, which required all the children of the city to be brought to it for baptism, and prohibited the parish priests of other churches from conferring baptism unless in case of necessity.[2]

240. Hence the rubric assigns as the proper place for baptism, not every church, but the church *in which there is a font*, or the baptistery. Generally speaking, however, there should be a font in every parish church, and every parish priest has the right to baptize the children of his parish.[3] In Ireland, since the destruction or usurpation of her ancient churches, there were very few baptismal fonts until recently; but they have been constructed, or are in course of construction, in almost every parish church at present; and the same may be said of England and America, pursuant to the decrees of the synods above mentioned.

§ XXXI.—**Itaque, necessitate excepta, in privatis locis nemo baptizari debet, nisi forte sint Regum aut magnorum Principum filii, id ipsis ita deposcentibus, dummodo id fiat in eorum Capellis seu Oratoriis, et in aqua Baptismali de more benedicta.**

241. The parish church or baptistery, then, is the only place in which baptism can be administered, except in the two cases here mentioned: 1st, In necessity—in which case baptism may be administered anywhere, but without

[1] Martene, loc. cit n. xv. Cavalieri, *De Fonte Baptismali*, in Decr. i. n. vii. and viii.

[2] *Instit.*, xcviii. n. 12.

[3] Vid. supra, 184.

the ceremonies. These are afterwards to be supplied in the church.[1] 2nd, When there is question of the children of kings and princes: In this case, at the special request of the parents, baptism may be conferred with all the ceremonies, in their oratories or private chapels. The water, however, cannot be blessed in a private chapel, but must be brought from the font of the parish church. If any of the baptismal water remains, it should be brought back to the church and poured into the font; and what has been used should be thrown into the sacrarium.[2] The rubric, we may observe, is merely permissive; leave must be asked and obtained in every case from the Ordinary of the place.[4]

242. It may be doubted whether, in this matter, all magnates, nobles, and men of great property can be regarded as "**magni principes**" to whom the favour may be extended. Catalani thinks they cannot;[5] and it is not easy to see how, in strictness, they can. But where there is a custom of extending the favour to them, St. Liguori would tolerate it.[6] At all events, it is probable that the bishop can dispense in particular cases.[7] When a distinguished person is expected to act as sponsor, if it be necessary to wait some time for him, the bishop could give leave to have baptism privately administered in the house, and the solemn ceremonies afterwards supplied in the church.[8]

[1] Vid supra, n. **194**, **195**.
[2] Baruff. tit. ix. n. 20. Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § xxxi. n. ii.
[3] Baruff. and Catal. ll. cc. Vid. supra, n. **183**.
[4] Baruff. n. 19. Catal. l. c. [5] Loc. cit. n. ii.
[6] Lib. vi. n. 118. *Not.* iii.
[7] Vid. Revue Théologique, I^ere^ serie, pp. 276. et seq.
[8] Cfr. Benedict XIV *Instit.* xcviii. n. 18.

In all other cases the law of the Church must be strictly observed. It is evidently *in materia gravi*, and the deliberate transgression of it, therefore, cannot be excused from grievous sin.[1]

§ XXXII.—**Baptisterium sit decenti loco et forma, materiaque solida, et quæ aquam bene contineat, decenter ornatum, et cancellis circumseptum, sera et clave munitum, atque ita obseratum, ut pulvis vel aliæ sordes intro non penetrent, in eoque, ubi commode fieri potest, depingatur imago Sancti Joannis Christum baptizantis.**

243. We have already seen[2] that "Baptisterium" is the name given to the place containing the baptismal font, whether it be a chapel within the church, or a building apart. But here it must be understood, at least in the first part of the sentence, to designate the font itself, or basin which contains the water. The rubric prescribes what is to be observed regarding it; and, first, that it be constructed in a suitable place. St. Charles orders that it be placed near the entrance of the church, on the left, in conformity with ancient usage, unless from the plan of the building the bishop may think it expedient to have it placed at the other side.[3] The place set apart for it should be railed off, and, if possible, form a distinct chapel, adorned with a representation of St. John baptizing Christ.

Its position near the entrance is convenient for the

[1] St. Lig. n. 142.

[2] Supra 239.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Pars i. Concil. Prov. iv. *Quæ pertinent ad Sacramentum Baptismi*, pag. 108.

ceremonies to be observed, as we shall see;[1] and, moreover, serves to remind us that by baptism we enter into the Church. Benedict XIII., in the Synod of Rome, ordered the strict observance of what the ritual prescribes regarding the place of the baptismal ceremony. "Quia "Baptismus est janua Sacramentorum et porta per quam "in Christi Ecclesiam intramus, sciant Parochi non vane "a Rituali Romano præscribi, ut baptizandorum catechis- "mus ad Ecclesiæ januam, his, cum patrinis, extra exis- "tentibus, peragatur. Ipsis itaque districte præcipimus "ut ritum omnino servent eundem, nec unquam com- "mittant, contrarius ultra procedat abusus: quemadmo- "dum et alter ille, domi scilicet infantes baptizandi extra "necessitatem, quæ si unquam eveniat, erit ab Episcopo "probanda".[2]

244. With respect to the material of which the font should be made, the rubric merely prescribes that it be solid, and such as will keep in the water; and, therefore, it may be of any kind that is not porous, unless some special material be required by diocesan or provincial statute. All the ancient fonts were of stone;[3] and St. Charles[4] prescribes that the material be marble or hard stone. "Fons baptismalis e marmore aut solido lapide "constet".

The Synod of Westminster recommends this instruction of St. Charles, and gives it in the appendix to its decrees, so that the material seems to be defined in England. The Synod of Thurles gives no special instruction

[1] Vid. infra, § liv.

[2] Concil. Roman. tit. xxvi., cap. iii., apud. Labbe, vol. xxi. pag. 1895.

[3] Catal. tit. ii., cap. i., § iv., n. xxi. [4] Loc. cit.

on the subject, and in Ireland some fonts have been made of metal, though stone or marble is generally preferred, and is, on the whole, more suitable, as being more in accordance with ancient usage, and also free from the inconvenience of rust, which sooner or later attacks the metal.

245. In shape, the ancient fonts were circular,[1] and being designed for baptism by immersion, were also large and deep. The fonts now in use for baptism by effusion are also circular or elliptical. The division into two parts, as recommended by the Ritual of Toulon,[2] is very convenient, and has been of late generally adopted. This form, amongst others, is minutely described in the instruction of St. Charles. In shape, according to the instruction, the font should be oval. "Forma ovata sit ac "longè cubitos duos et uncias octo pateat; latè cubitum "unum èt uncias duodecim"; that is, about three feet six inches, by two feet four inches, of our measure. The interior should be divided into two circular basins, of the same dimensions, and separated about two inches at the edges—the one which is nearer to the high altar, to contain the baptismal water; the other, to receive the water poured on the head, and, communicating with the earth, to serve as the sacrarium. The whole should be supported on a perforated pillar, through which the water from the second basin may pass to a small cistern under ground.[3]

[1] Catal. tit. ii., cap. i., § iv., n. xxii.

[2] Tit. i. § xi. apud Dictionnaire des Ceremonies, tom. i. Art. *Bapteme.*

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Pars. iv. Instruct. Fabric., Eccl., cap. xix. § *De Baptisterii forma tertia*, pag. 483-4.

246. The Ritual of Toulon[1] would have the basin which holds the water larger than the other, and it is usually made so; but it would also have it lined with lead or tin, or have a vessel of this material, or of tinned copper, inserted in the stone. De Herdt recommends the same.[2] Many of the ancient fonts used in England were lined with lead. Indeed, according to a recent writer on the subject,[3] all that were not of granite or very hard stone, were so lined.

Such lining with metal is quite unnecessary, if the font be of hard stone or marble, as is prescribed by St. Charles. He would permit the use of metal in this way, when the font is observed to be leaky or porous, *but only until another is constructed of proper material.*[4]

247. The font should have a lid, which may be of wood or metal, fitting closely, so as to exclude dust, flies, etc. If it be constructed with two basins as described, the lid need not cover that which serves as the sacrarium. In the instructions of St. Charles,[5] it is directed that the lid be flat, only one-half opening, the other being fastened, and the whole surmounted by a dome or canopy within which the holy oils should be kept. The rubric says nothing of this, and, therefore, leaves considerable latitude as to the shape and construction of the covering. It requires, however, that the baptistery be under lock and key, by which, therefore, either the lid of the font, or the entrance to the baptistery ought to be secured.

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Pars. vi. n. 3, § i.

[3] F. A. Paley, M.A. *Illustrations of Baptismal Fonts*, introduction, pag. 24.

[4] Concil. Provin. iv., § *Quæ pertinent ad Sacram. Baptismi*, pag. 108.

[5] Loc. cit.

ON THE HOLY OILS AND OTHER REQUISITES.

DE SACRIS OLEIS ET ALIIS REQUISITIS.

§ XXXIII.—Sacrum Chrisma, et Sanctum Oleum, quod et Catechumenorum dicitur, quorum usus est in Baptismo, eodem anno sint ab Episcopo de more benedicta Feria V, in Cœna Domini.

248. The chrism, which is a mixture of oil and balsam,[1] and the oil of catechumens used in baptism, must have been blessed by the bishop on the preceding Holy Thursday.

The use of the holy oils in baptism may be traced to the earliest times, as is shown by Catalani.[2] The anointing of the catechumens before baptism, is mentioned by St. Justin Martyr, St. Chrysostom, etc.[3] With respect to the unction with chrism after baptism, we may observe that in the beginning, the bishop, as we have seen,[4] was usually the minister, and he signed the neophytes on the forehead with chrism immediately after baptizing them, so that the chrism used by the bishop was in reality for the sacrament of confirmation. The vertical unction by priests was introduced, according to Bellarmine,[5] to supply in some way for this, when the bishop was absent, and when, consequently, confirmation could not be immediately conferred as usual. It is said to have been instituted by Pope Sylvester I.[6] Innocent I. in a letter

[1] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 162 [2] Tit. ii. cap. i. § xxxiii.
[3] Cit. apud Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. vi. n. xv. et. art. xiii. n. xxi.
[4] Supra, n. 184. [5] *De Baptismo*, cap. xxvii.
[6] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. ii.

regarding this matter, says that priests may anoint those whom they baptize, with chrism blessed by the bishop; but they must not apply it to the forehead, as this is reserved to bishops.[1] From the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, it appears that the vertical unction was applied by a priest, even when the bishop was present and confirmed the neophytes immediately after.[2] The same may be also inferred from the Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius.[3] There can be no doubt, therefore, about the great antiquity of this vertical unction with chrism, distinct from the sacrament of Confirmation. It is to be applied even by the bishop when he baptizes, though he may confer the sacrament of Confirmation immediately after.[4]

249. The chrism must be blessed by the bishop. A simple priest may be delegated by the Pope to confer confirmation, but it is doubtful whether he could be empowered to bless the chrism, which is necessary for the sacrament.[5] In the Greek Church the priest blesses the oil of catechumens just before using it; but, although he administers the sacrament of confirmation immediately after baptism, the chrism which he uses must have been blessed by the bishop.[6] In the vertical unction, there is no sacrament, it is true, but the chrism to be used is the same as that which is required for confirmation.

[1] Cit. apud St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 163 Dub. 2.

[2] Chardon, *Histoire des Sacrements*, liv. 1re sec. 1re part. 2de chap. x.

[3] Apud Martene, cap. i. art. xviii. ord. iv.

[4] Pontificale Romanum, *Ritus Pontif. pro Baptismo Adultorum. Rubricæ* in fine.

[5] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 163, Dub. 2. Vid. Benedict XVI., *Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. viii.

[6] Goar, *in Baptismatis officium Notæ*. Nota 11, pag. 363.

250. The consecration of the oils takes place on Holy Thursday, and, according to the present usage, is not permitted on any other day.[1] The bishop is assisted in the ceremony by twelve priests, seven deacons, and seven sub-deacons.[2] In cases of necessity, however, dispensations are granted both as to the day and the number of assistants.[3] In Ireland bishops have the faculty: "Consecrandi olea cum quinque saltem sacerdotibus, non "tamen extra diem Cœnæ Domini nisi necessitas aliud "urgeat".[4]

§ XXXIV.—**Curet Parochus, ut ea suo tempore quamprimum habeat, et tunc vetera in Ecclesia comburat.**

251. The parish priest is strictly bound by the canons to procure the holy oils every year from his own bishop, and not from any other, unless with his own bishop's consent.[5] He must take care to procure them as soon as possible after they are consecrated, since he requires them for the benediction of the font on Holy Saturday. The functions of this day should never be omitted in parochial churches, according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation. Where the number of clergy is insufficient to carry out the ceremonies of the missal, they should be performed according to the small ceremonial of Benedict XIII.[6]

[1] Catal, tit. ii cap. i. § xxxiii. n. v.

[2] Pontif. Romanum, *De Officio in Feria V. Cœnæ Domini.*

[3] S. C. R. 28 Jan. 1644, *in Emonien*, n. 1486—9 Mart. 1765, *in Ramaten*, n. 4325. [4] Formula vi^ta^ n. 28.

[5] Catal., tit. ii. cap. i. § xxxiv. n. i. Cavalieri, vol. iv. cap. xxvi. *De sacris oleis*, in Decr. i. n. iii.

[6] 21 Jul, 1848, *in una Ord. Carm.* n. 5132.

The Sacred Congregation has expressly condemned the custom prevailing in some places, of deferring the distribution of the oils until after Low Sunday.[1] In a note to the decree condemning this custom, the Annotator observes that the holy oils should be distributed so that they may be available for the benediction of the font on Holy Saturday. He cites the "quamprimum" of our rubric, and says that it must be interpreted by the obligation of using the new oils on Holy Saturday. Nothing, according to him, but the necessity arising from great distance, difficult roads, or the like, could justify a delay beyond that time on the part either of those who receive, or of those who distribute them.

252. Benedict XIV., while Archbishop of Bologna, earnestly exhorted the parish priests of his diocese who had baptismal fonts to be blessed, to procure the holy oils in time for the ceremonies of Holy Saturday. But he did no more than exhort and recommend; and, as the time of distribution for all in the city and diocese, he fixed from Holy Thursday till "Sabbatum in Albis". "A feria quinta in Cœna Domini, statim ac oleum sacra-"tum fuerit, usque ad Sabbatum in Albis pro ipso acci-"piendo tempus statuitur omnibus qui vel in civitate "aut in diocesi versantur. Parochos tamen Diocesanos, "qui baptismalem fontem suis in Ecclesiis habent, mag-"nopere hortamur satagere omni studio, ut Oleum a nobis "eadem feria quinta consecratum statim obtineant, quo "utantur Sabbato majoris hebdomadæ, cum benedictio "Fontis Baptismalis instituitur, quæ sacrum Chrisma

[1] 16 Dec., 1826, *in una Gandav.*, ad. iv. n 4623.

"necessario requirit; et valde commendandi sunt, si tunc "recens Chrisma a nobis sacratum adhibeant".[1]

253. These words seem to convey that the old oils should be used for the benediction of the font on Holy Saturday, if the new oils, no matter from what cause, have not been procured in time. They are understood in this sense by Cavalieri;[2] but, according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation, it is necessary to take the circumstances into account, and make a distinction. Either there is a prospect of getting the holy oils within a short time, a week or ten days suppose, or there is no prospect of getting them within a reasonable time. In the former case, the infusion of the oils should be omitted in the ceremony of blessing the font, and be supplied privately as soon as the oils are procured. In the latter, the oil and chrism of the preceding year are to be used, and the water thus blessed is to be preserved in the font, and used until the vigil of Pentecost, even though the new oils may have been obtained in the meantime.

Such is the latest decision of the Congregation of Rites on the question.[3] This decision is given by the "Ana-"lecta Juris Pontificii",[4] by the "Revue Théologique",[5] and also in the last edition of the *Sac. Rit. Cong. Decreta, etc., alphabetico ordine disposita*, etc., by Falise.[6] It may be seen on reading it,[7] that it serves to reconcile two previous decisions apparently at variance, but of whose authenticity

[1] *Instit.*, lxxxi. n. 5 [2] Loc. cit. n. vi.
[3] 12 Aug., 1854, *in Lucionen* ad. 79 et. 80.
[4] II^me^ Serie, pag. 2188 et seq. [5] VI^me^ Serie Fevrier, 1859, pag. 27.
[6] Editio 4^ta^, MDCCLXII. *V. Baptisma*, n. 7.
[7] Vid Decret. in Appendice.

there can be no doubt—one directing that the holy oils, if not procured in time for the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday, should be afterwards poured in "privatim et separatim";[1] the other deciding that, when they cannot be procured, the oils of the preceding year are to be used.[2] Of these two decrees it declares, that the former proceeds on the supposition that the holy oils are only accidentally detained, and that there is a prospect of getting them within a short time; while the latter proceeds on the supposition that they could not be procured in the diocese, or in any of the neighbouring dioceses. This supposition was plainly involved in the case proposed to the Sacred Congregation, for it regarded a diocese in Spain during the civil wars, when most of the sees in the country were deprived of their pastors. Now, the fact of its thus reconciling two apparently conflicting decisions, together with its being cited by the authorities mentioned, makes us look on the authenticity of the decree as all but certain, although a slight doubt may still be suggested by its being omitted in the last edition of the "Decreta Authentica", etc, by the Propaganda press, since that edition gives the decrees down to 29th November, 1856.[3]

254. When the new oils have been procured, what remains of the old oils should be burned. If there be any contained in bottles or other vessels destined to hold the

[1] 12 April, 1755, *in Lucana* ad. 3^m^ n. 4252. Vid. Gardellini, *Annotationem in Decr. Sac. Cong. Rit.*, 16 Dec., 1826. *in Gandaven. Ques.* v. ad iii. n. 4623.

[2] 23 Sept., 1837, *in Oriolen*, ad 1^m^ et 3^m^ n. 4820.

[3] Vid. supra, n. 37.

usual supply for the year, it should be burned in the lamp before the blessed sacrament; but what is contained absorbed in cotton in the oil stocks for ordinary use, should be burned with the cotton containing it, as is directed by the rubric of the Pontificale Romanum.[1] The cotton, before it is burned, may be squeezed over the lamps, and the ashes should be thrown into the sacrarium.[2]

§ XXXV.—**Veteribus Olcis, nisi necessitas cogat, ultra annum non utatur: ac si deficere videantur, et Chrisma, aut Oleum benedictum haberi non possit, aliud Oleum de ollvis non benedictum adjiciatur, sed in minori quantitate.**

255. As soon as the oils are blessed on Holy Thursday, the use of the oils of the preceding year should cease, unless a case of necessity arises before the new oils are procured. If there be no prospect of getting them within a reasonable time, it has been decided, as we have seen,[3] that the old oils are to be used in blessing the font. It is further decided in the same decree that they are to be used also for the unctions in baptism.[4] There is therefore, no difficulty in this case.

256. But if the oils can be procured within a few days, and if in the mean time an infant be presented for baptism, what should be done? There are two difficulties in the case—one with regard to the water to be used, and the other with regard to the oil and chrism. 1° With regard to the water. If the baptism takes place before the font is blessed on Holy Saturday, the old baptismal water still

[1] Pars. iii. *De Officio in Feria V.* in fine.
[2] Caval. l. c. n. viii.
[3] Supra, n. 253.
[4] 23 Sept. 1837, *in Oriolen.* ad 4^m n. 4820.

remains, and of course should be used. If it takes place after, the choice is between common water and the water of the font, which, as we suppose, is blessed, but as yet without the infusion of the holy oils.[1] We should prefer to use the water of the font, though we dont think there is any *obligation* of using it since it is not, in strictness, baptismal water.[2] But it would be best of all, in the circumstances we here suppose, to reserve a little of the old baptismal water for such contingencies, until the new oils are procured. This is recommended by Romsée,[3] and the "Revue Théologique".[4] 2° With regard to the unctions. These are to be deferred until the new oil and chrism are obtained. This appears to follow from the decision that has been cited,[5] for if, in the case supposed, the old oils are not to be used in blessing the baptismal water, it may be reasonably inferred that they should not be used in the baptismal unctions. This is also clearly supposed by St. Liguori.[6] On account of the necessity of deferring the unctions, it would be desirable that the baptism also should be deferred, as it should not be separated from the unctions without a grave reason. St. Liguori[7] decides that if the delay is only for a few days baptism ought to be deferred, but if it be necessary to wait for the oils ten or eleven days, baptism may be administered, and the unctions afterwards supplied. He speaks only of the unctions, and seems to suppose that the other ceremonies are applied when baptism is conferred, as is

[1] Vid. supra, n. 253. [2] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxviii.
[3] *Praxis Divini Officii*, tom. iii. De Sabbato Sancto, § iii. in fine
[4] IV^me^ serie Fevrier 1859, pag. 28.
[5] Supra n. 253. [6] Lib. vi. n. 141. [7] Loc. cit.

recommended in an opinion cited, apparently with approval, by Lacroix.[1] But it is probable that the other ceremonies may be deferred with the unctions — so that ultimately the case we are discussing may be resolved in practice, by either putting off the baptism for a few days until the new oils are procured, or conferring it as the rubric directs for the case of necessity,[2] leaving the usual ceremonies to be supplied when the new oil and chrism are obtained.

257. Should the supply of chrism or oil become short during the year, more should be got from the cathedral or other place where a quantity is usually kept in reserve.[3] If, however, there be any difficulty in procuring it in this way, or if there be not time to wait, unblessed oil may be added, but in less quantity. In Ireland, during the operation of the penal laws, the priests were obliged to have recourse frequently to this means of keeping up a supply of the holy oils. Amongst the ordinances drawn up for their direction about the middle of the seventeenth century, we find one prescribing that the quantity of unblessed oil added each time shall not exceed a third part.[4] Great care should be taken that the oil be pure "**Oleum ex olivis**", as is mentioned in the rubric.

258. It is plain from the words that it may be added to the chrism as well as to the other oils, and it may be added too, not once merely, or twice, but as often as may be found necessary, even although the quantity of un-

[1] Lib. vi. pars. i. n. 342.

[2] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxvi.

[3] Cfr Catal, tit. ii. cap. i. § xxxv. n. ii.

[4] *Collections on Irish Church History*, page 122.

blessed oil thus added may in the end exceed the quantity first blessed. This was expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation of the Council.[1] But there must be *bonâ fide* necessity, such as is supposed in the rubric, for it was decided by the Congregation of Rites that it would not be lawful, *e.g.* on Holy Thursday to add a quantity of unblessed oil to what had just been consecrated.[2]

§ XXXVI.—Chrisma et Oleum sacrum sint in suis vasculis argenteis, aut saltem stannels, bene obturatis: quæ vascula sint inter se distincta, et propriam unumquodque inscriptionem habeat majusculis litteris incisam, ne quis error committatur.

259. The necessity of attending to what is here prescribed is obvious. In Baptism there is no question of the validity of the sacrament, but it is not so in Confirmation and Extreme Unction. A mistake with regard to the vessel in either of these would render the validity of the sacrament at least doubtful.[3] Even in Baptism the mistake is a serious one. Should it occur, Baruffaldi[4] would have the unction afterwards supplied. This ought to be done, at least if the error be detected at the moment and can be at once repaired; but otherwise we are inclined to the opinion of Falise, who thinks it too severe to insist on the repetition, seeing that; 1° one oil is probably a *valid* substitute for another, even where there is question

[1] 23 Sept., 1682, cit. apud Falise. *Decreta Authentica*, etc. V. Oleum in nota, n. 6.

[2] 7 Dec., 1844, *in una Patav*, ad. 4^m, n. 5000.

[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 162 et 709. Vid. chap. xv. § iii.

[4] Tit. x. n. 19.

of a sacrament;[1] 2° that there is here question of a rite, the omission of which does little or no injury: and 3° that the repetition would often be an occasion of murmur or scandal.[2] To guard against mistake, the rubric here directs that the vessels containing the holy oils be marked with letters, so as to be easily distinguished.

260. They should be of silver, or, at least, of tin or pewter; they must not be of glass or any other brittle material, lest they be broken and the contents spilled;—nor of iron, brass, or other very oxidable metal, from which the oil would easily contract impurities.[3]

§ XXXVII.—**Ad usum vero quotidianum minora habeantur vascula ex argento, si fieri potest, aut stanno, sive separata, sive etiam conjuncta; apte tamen distincta, et bene cooperta, et cum suis inscriptionibus, ut supra, ne Parochus aberret, et unum pro altero sumat, quod cavere debet diligenter.**

261. Besides the vessels for containing the yearly supply, there should be smaller ones to contain what may be required for daily use. The material prescribed by the rubric for these is the same as for the others, but being much smaller, they can be had of silver at much less expense; and few are made of any other material. They may be, according to the rubric, either separate or joined together. In missionary countries they are usually made to be joined by a screw, and, with a third compartment containing the "oleum infirmorum" likewise screwed on, they form a cylinder about one inch in diameter, and

[1] Vid. chap. xv., § iii.

[2] *Cours. Abèrgè*, 3me partie, chap. i. § i. n. 8. note.

[3] Vid. Baruff. tit x. n. 16 et seq.

three or three and a half inches long, commonly called "oilstocks". The compartments are perfectly distinct, and marked, each with its appropriate letter.

262. It was usual to put only a single letter on each —I on that containing the "oleum Infirmorum"; B on that containing the "oleum Catechumenorum", or oleum Baptizandorum; and C on that containing the Chrism. This, we may observe, is hardly sufficient, for it might easily happen that the compartment marked C would be mistaken for that containing the "oleum Catechumenorum"; and to our certain knowledge the mistake was actually made in some instances. It is much better, therefore, to have the first two or three letters engraved on each—as, INF., CAT., CHR. St. Charles ordered the inscriptions to be respectively: CHR., CATH., and EXT. UNC.[1]

We may observe, also, that, although formerly it was convenient for priests in Ireland to have the three joined together, there is now no reason why the two required for baptism should not be kept apart from the third, which is required for the sick.[2]

§ XXXVIII.—**In ea igitur ex majoribus vasculis Chrismatis et Olei, quod sufficiat, infundatur, atque ut effusionis periculum caveatur, commodum erit in his vasculis bombacium, seu quid simile habere, Oleo sacro et Chrismate separatim perfusum, in quo pollex, cum opus est, ad inungendum immittatur.**

263. The oil-stocks should always be provided, as here

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Instruct Supell. Eccles., lib. ii. pag. 530.

[2] Vid. inf. § xxxix.

directed, with a little cotton, or some like material, which may absorb the oil, and thus prevent the danger of effusion; and, at the same time, when pressed with the thumb, yield enough for the unctions. A little flax, or a small piece of sponge, would do equally well.[1]

264. The rubric supposes that a little is poured into the oil-stocks out of the larger vessels as occasion may require—but it may happen that the priest has no vessels except the oil-stocks, and that there is no other supply for the year except what is put into them when the oils are distributed after Holy Thursday. If the supply be insufficient, he must, in this case, either go to the cathedral to have the oil stocks replenished, or add a little unblessed oil in the manner already mentioned.[2]

265. There is no reason, however, why every parish church should not have its supply of holy oils as well as its baptismal font. The larger vessels should be filled at the place of distribution, and brought back in time for Holy Saturday.[3] In fact, the quantity which oil-stocks of the usual size could contain, would hardly suffice for the benediction of the font on that day, to say nothing of what is required for the vigil of Pentecost, or may be necessary at other times for blessing the baptismal water.[4] It is hardly possible, therefore, to carry out what is prescribed by a preceding rubric regarding the water to be used in baptism,[5] without attending to what is here prescribed regarding the oils.

[1] Baruff. tit. x. n. 22-23. Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § xxxviii., n. i.
[2] Supra, n. 257.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 251.
[4] Vid chap. ix. § vi.
[5] Supra. n. 158.

§ XXXIX.—Hæc vascula ita parata, in loco proprio, honesto, ac mundo, sub clave ac tuta custodia decenter asserventur, ne ab aliquo, nisi a Sacerdote, temere tangantur, aut eis sacrilege quispiam abuti possit.

266. At the end of the mass at which the holy oils are blessed, the bishop admonishes the priests to keep them carefully as the canons prescribe.[1] The oil and chrism used in baptism should be kept under lock and key, and if possible in the baptistery, which is undoubtedly the best place for them.[2] St. Charles gives very minute instructions on this subject. He would have the vessels enclosed in a box with a lid fitting closely, and kept in what he calls a "ciborium", which means a kind of press or safe, erected over the font.[3]

If they cannot be conveniently kept in the baptistery, they should be kept at least somewhere within the church. The rubric, it is true, does not mention the church, but this must be understood from the words it uses, and from the universal custom, as is observed by the continuator of Gardellini in a note to a decree of the Sacred Congregation in this matter.[4] Perhaps the reason why the rubric does not say that the place must be within the church is, because the baptistery (in which they certainly may be kept), is in some instances a building apart from the church.[5] They cannot be put into the tabernacle

[1] Pontificale Romanum, p. iii, *De Officio in Feria* V. *Cœnæ Domini*, in fine.

[2] Baruff, tit. x. n. 24.

[3] *Instr. Supell. Eccl.*, lib. ii. pars. ii., pag. 530. Concil. Prov. iv. p. ii., pag. 108.

[4] 16 December, 1826, *in una Gandav. Dub. Quæs.* iii. n. 4623.

[5] Vid. supra, n. 239.

with the Blessed Sacrament, as was decided by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops.[1] But it is recommended by many to place them in a safe near the altar, where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, as there would thus be a lamp burning before, or near them.[2]

267. Priests are permitted to keep the "oleum infir-"morum" in their houses, when they live at a considerable distance from the church,[3] and in the country parishes of Ireland they generally do so; but the same reason does not exist for keeping along with it the oil and chrism used in baptism. These, except in rare cases, can be used only in the church;[4] and we are convinced that the exceptional cases are not sufficient to justify a priest in keeping them in his house. Hence, we think that a little vessel of silver containing the "oleum infirmo-"rum" alone, might, in most cases, be conveniently substituted for the oil-stocks that have been hitherto in use; two other little vessels of the same kind for the chrism and oil of catechumens being kept in the baptistery, or in a safe near the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. In England the Synod of Westminster has ordered, that in all new churches a proper place be prepared for them in the baptistery.[5]

268. Laics are not permitted to touch these vessels unless in case of necessity. Baruffaldi says, that a laic is guilty of grievous sin if he does so.[6] This decision seems

[1] 3. Maii. 1693. cit. apud Caval., tom. iv. cap. vi., Decr. xiii. n. i.

[2] Cfr. *Annotat. cit.* in Decr. Sac. Cong., 16 Dec., 1826.

[3] Sac. Cong., 16 Dec., 1826, *in una Gandav. ad Dub. Quæs.* iii. n. 4623.

[4] Vid. chap. iv. § xxviii.

[5] Dec. xvi. *De Baptismo*, 2°.

[6] Tit. x. n. 25.

to us very severe. The offence, we think, does not exceed a venial sin, unless where there is contempt. At all events the decision must be understood of the case in which they actually consecrate the holy oils, for as they are not consecrated, nor even blessed, there seems no reason why they may not when empty be handled by any one.[1]

The sacrilegious abuse here referred to, is probably that of applying the holy oils to medicinal purposes, or as charms, etc. It appears from several canons that such superstitious practices prevailed at certain periods;[2] and hence, in the admonition of the bishop already mentioned, the priests are specially warned to guard against this profanation.[3]

§ XL.—**Parochus, quantum fieri potest, curet, ne per laicos, sed per se, vel per alium Sacerdotem, vel saltem per alium Ecclesiæ ministrum hæc Olea deferantur: caveat item, ne de iis quicquam alli unquam tribuat cujusvis rei prætextu.**

269. The preceding rubric is to guard against any sacrilegious abuse of the holy oils. This is to secure due reverence for them. Catalani cites a series of canons and decrees, from the fourth council of Carthage in 398, downwards for several centuries, ordering that none but priests or others in holy orders, should carry the holy oils from the place where they are distributed to the several churches.[4] In the fourteenth century the prac-

[1] Vid. chap. xi. § v.

[2] Cfr. Catal. tit. ii., cap. i. § xxxix. n. il. et seq.

[3] Pontificale Romanum, loc. cit.

[4] Loc. cit. § xl. n. i. et ii. Cfr. Caval. tom. iv. cap. xxvi. *De Sacris Oleis*, in Decr. i. n. iii. et iv.

tice had been introduced of allowing them to be carried by inferior clerics; but this was forbidden by several provincial councils, amongst the rest, by that of Milan, under St. Charles.[1] The present rubric requires the ancient discipline to be observed as far as possible.

By "**ministrum**", Catalani[2] thinks we should understand a deacon or subdeacon. Baruffaldi[3] allows it to include inferior clerics. At all events it is plain from the words "**quantum fieri potest**", that the rubric permits the oils to be carried by an inferior cleric, or even by a laic, when no other can be had.[4] None is to be given away under any pretence, and this for the reason already stated.[5]

§ XLI.—**Sal, quod in os baptizandi immittendum est, sit benedictum sua peculiari benedictione, quæ infra præscribitur; neque utatur sale exorcizato ad benedicendam aquam, sitque prius bene confractum et attritum, siccum ac mundum. Sal ita benedictum nemini tradatur, neque etiam iis qui benedicendum attulerint reddatur, sed ad alios baptizandos servetur, aut in sacrarium abjiciatur.**

270. According to Martene,[6] no mention is made of the salt given to catechumens, by any of the early Greek Fathers, except Origen, who seems to make an allusion to it once, nor is it mentioned in the Euchologium of the Grecks. But amongst the Latins its use dates from the earliest times. It is distinctly mentioned by St. Augustine

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. i. Concil. Provin. ii. Dec. ix. pag. 52, et pars. ii. Synod Dioc., ii. Dec. xiv. pag. 270.
[2] Loc. cit. n. iv.
[3] Tit. x. n. 29.
[4] Vid. chap. xv. § xiii.
[5] Supra, n. 268.
[6] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. vi. n. xiv.

in his confessions, by venerable Bede, and subsequent writers.[1] It should be "sal naturale",[2] that is, such as is used for seasoning food, and as is commonly understood by the word itself without an adjunct.

271. There are two benedictions of salt given in the Ritual—one for baptism, the other for holy water; and care must be taken that the salt used in baptism has been blessed according to the special form given hereafter.[3] It should be reduced to a fine powder, as is here directed by the rubric, so that a very small quantity may be easily administered. What is blessed at one time may serve for several baptisms, if it be kept clean and dry: but the rubric directs that it be kept exclusively for this purpose, or else thrown into the sacrarium, and not given away under any pretext, most probably lest it might be employed for some superstitious purpose.[4] It must not be given even to those who may have brought it to be blessed. If they wish to have some blessed salt, the priest may bless some for them, using the benediction given in the Ritual, or at the end of the Missal "Ad quodcumque comestibile".[5]

§ XLII.—**Cum igitur Baptismi Sacramentum jam administrandum est, hæc in promptu esse debent.**

272. The rubric now gives a summary of the things that should be at hand in the baptistery, or in a convenient place near the font, when baptism is about being

[1] Cit. apud Martene, ibid.
[2] Baruff. tit. x. n. 33. Catal. tit. ii. cap. i. § xli. n. iii.
[3] Cap. iv. § v.
[4] Baruff., n. 34. Catal., l. c. n. iv.
[5] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 4. ii.

conferred. The priest who is to perform the ceremony should carefully read over this summary, and see that every thing required is in readiness, so that there may be no interruption or delay when he has once commenced.[1]

§ XLIII.—**Vascula sacri Olei Catechumenorum, et Chrismatis.**

273. It would be convenient to have a table near the font, on which several of the things required might be placed before the commencement of the ceremony. Amongst these should be the small vessels containing the oil and chrism which have been before described.[2]

§ XLIV.—**Vasculum cum sale benedicendo, vel jam, ut dictum est, benedicto.**

274. The salt is required soon after the commencement, and before the child is admitted within the church. This vessel then, which may be a small plate or salver, should be placed on a table within the porch or near the door, according to circumstances,[3] or it may be held by a clerk.

§ XLV.—**Vasculum, seu cochleare ex argento, vel alio metallo nitidum, ad aquam Baptismi fundendam super caput baptizandi, quod nulli præterea alii usui deserviat.**

275. The water should be poured on the head, not with the hand, but out of a ladle or small vessel provided for this purpose, and used for no other. This vessel, according to our rubric, should be of silver or some other

[1] Baruff., n. 36, 37.
[2] Supra. n. 261.
[3] Vid. infra, § liv.

metal not easily tarnished. It may be made also of shell, according to Baruffaldi.[1] Pewter or tin (*stannum*) is mentioned by many[2] as a suitable material; and that it is so may be inferred from the rubric regarding the vessels for containing the holy oils.[3]

St. Charles gives minute instructions as to its form. According to these, it should be furnished with a pretty long handle, somewhat bent, and a lip or spout through which the water might be easily poured in a gentle steady stream.[4] It should be also large enough to hold what may suffice for a single baptism, as it would be inconvenient to be obliged to dip it into the font while pronouncing the form.[5]

§ XLVI.—**Pelvis, seu bacile ad excipiendam aquam ex capite defluentem, nisi statim in sacrarium defluat.**

276. Nothing is prescribed as to the material of this basin. It may be of earthenware, but should be reserved for the use of the baptistery exclusively. We have already seen, however, that the sacrarium may be situated so as to render any such vessel unnecessary.[6]

§ XLVII.—**Gossipium, alio nomine bombacium, seu quid simile, ad abstergenda loca sacris Oleis inuncta.**

277. The cotton, flax, or other material to be used for

[1] Tit. x. n. 39.
[2] Baruff. l. c. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 4. iii. [3] Supra, n. 260.
[4] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. Inst. Fab. Eccl. cap. xix. *De Baptisterio*, pag. 480.
[5] Baruff., l. c. De Herdt., l. c. [6] Supra, n. 182.

wiping the parts anointed, should be placed on a small dish or salver beside the holy oils on the table. When used, it should be put back again on the dish, and after the ceremony is concluded, it should be burned, and the ashes thrown into the sacrarium.[1]

§ XLVII.—**Stolæ duæ, ubi commode haberi possunt, una violacea, et altera alba, ut infra notatur, mutanda; alia minus, una saltem adhibeatur.**

278. Baruffaldi justly observes that there are few churches so poor as not to be able easily to provide the two stoles required for the ceremony, and is very severe on the negligence or parsimony of those pastors who fail to do so.[2] The white stole may be left on the table beside the font; the violet stole is put on with the surplice at the commencement, and exchanged for the white one at the proper time.[3]

279. The present rubric tolerates the use of the same stole during the whole ceremony. In this case it may be either white or violet, but we should prefer, with Falise[4] and De Herdt, who cites the pastoral of Bruges,[5] to have it double—white on one side and violet on the other—so that it might be reversed at the time marked for the exchange, and thus be equivalent to two stoles. Baruffaldi[6] seems to reprobate the use of this double stole; but on examining his words, it will be seen that he

[1] Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xxiv.
[2] Tit. ii. n. 54, et tit. x. n. 41.
[3] Chap. iv. § xv.
[4] *Du Sacrement de Baptême*, § i. n. 10.
[5] Pars. vi. n. 4, vi.
[6] Loc. cit.

does so only when it is adopted as a matter of choice, or from a motive of parsimony, in preference to two distinct stoles; but he does not imply that it is not preferable to a single stole of one colour.

§ XLIX.—**Medulla panis, qua inuncti Sacerdotis digiti, cum manus lavat, abstergantur; et vas pro manuum lotione post Baptismum, quod huic tantum usui deservire decet.**

280. A crumb of bread, or a little dry meal, is the best means of removing the oil from the fingers. This, as well as the basin for washing the priest's hands, may be placed on a corner of the table already mentioned, or in any other convenient place in the baptistery. The rubric seems to require that the basin be reserved for this use exclusively. At least it should not be used for any merely profane purpose; but we would not condemn its being used for receiving the water flowing from the head, and conveying it to the sacrarium.[1]

281. It is strange, as Catalani observes,[2] that the rubric, notwithstanding its minuteness, makes no mention of the towel, which, manifestly, should be in readiness for drying the hands. There should be another towel also for the purpose of drying the child's head after the water has been poured on it.[3]

§ L.—**Alba vestis in modum pallioli, seu linteolum candidum, infantis capiti imponendum.**

282. It is the custom in most places for the parents or

[1] Supra, n. 183.
[2] Tit. ii. cap. i. § xlvii, n. 1.
[3] Baruff., tit. x. n. 48. Vid. infra, chap. iv. § xvii.

sponsors to bring with them this white linen garment. It is usually a piece of plain linen, about the size of a small handkerchief, though it was formerly a complete garment, which was worn by the neophytes for some time after their baptism.[1] It should be placed on the table beside the holy oils, so as to be at hand when required. It would be well to have one or two at all times in the baptistery, lest in some instance those who bring the child should come without one.[2]

§ LI.—**Cereus, seu candela cerea, baptizato ardens tradenda.**

283. The wax candle, as well as the linen garment, is presented by the parents or sponsors, according to the custom existing in many places.[3] Such a custom might be made a convenient means of supplying wax candles for the use of the altar in parishes where no other provision exists for the purpose. The candle should be placed on the table with the rest. The rubric does not require that it be lighted from the commencement of the ceremony, though this is prescribed in some rituals, as in that of Ghent.[4] St. Charles in his instructions[5] required that during the ceremony there should be two lighted candles on the table, or, if convenient, on the altar of the baptistery. In this matter each one may follow the approved custom of his diocese, but the rubric requires no

[1] Vid. chap. iv. § xxii.
[2] Baruff., tit. x. n. 45.
[3] Baruff., n. 49. Catal., tit. ii. cap. i. § li.
[4] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 5. xx.
[5] *Act. Eccles. Mediol.*, pars. iv. § *De iis quæ Parochus servet et paret antequam Baptismum ministret*, pag. 415.

more than that the candle be burning when it is presented by the priest.

§ LII.—**Hic denique Rituale liber sit paratus; et item liber Baptismalis, in quo baptizati describuntur.**

284. The ritual to be used is no other than the Roman. We have already discussed the obligation of observing what it prescribes, as far as circumstances permit.[1] Generally speaking, there can be nothing to prevent an exact compliance with all that it prescribes regarding baptism when solemnly administered in the church. The ritual itself warns the minister not to trust too easily to his memory, but to recite everything out of the book,[2] which he should, therefore, have at hand, as he is here directed. He should have in readiness also the baptismal register, in which he is to inscribe the names of the baptized and of the sponsors, in the manner prescribed at the end of the ritual.

§ LIII.—**Omnibus igitur opportune præparatis, Sacerdos ad tanti Sacramenti administrationem, lotis manibus, superpelliceo et stola violacea indutus, accedat: Clericum unum seu plures, si potest, secum adhibeat, superpelliceo pariter indutos, qui sibi ministrent.**

285. All things being prepared both in the baptistery and at the church porch, the priest, already vested in soutane,[3] washes his hands, and then puts on a surplice

[1] Vid. chap. i. n. 65. et seq.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 119.
[3] Supra, n. 128.

and violet stole. Baruffaldi[1] would prefer that he should vest and unvest at the font, but we believe the sacristy will, generally speaking, be found the most convenient place, the vestments being usually kept there. The clerk or clerks who are to attend him should be already vested in soutane and surplice,[2] and be prepared to present him with the water and towel, and assist him in vesting.

286. Should baptism be administered, as is often the case, immediately after Mass, it may be asked, whether the priest may not, in such circumstances, retain the alb and stole—having laid aside the chasuble and maniple. We think that in strictness he may, especially since, according to Catalani,[3] the surplice is but a substitute for the alb, which was formerly in use. But it is to be observed that, in the first place, he cannot do so unless the stole be violet, as is plain from the rubric; and that secondly, the trouble of changing it for a white stole at the time marked,[4] will be much greater in consequence of its being fastened by the cincture.[5] We think, therefore, that, in the case supposed, it is not only more in accordance with the letter of the rubric, but on the whole more convenient for the priest himself, to lay aside the alb and put on a surplice.

287. No mention is made in our text of the cap or berretta, but De Herdt says that the priest goes towards the porch, "tecto capite et junctis manibus".[6] The Ritual of Toulon[7] also prescribes that the priest wear his

[1] Tit. x. n. 54.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 126-7.
[3] Tit. ii. cap. i. § liii. n. ii.
[4] Infra, chap. iv. § xv.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 123.
[6] Pars. vi. n. 5, i.
[7] *Baptême*, tit. ii. § ii.

cap at the commencement, and directs him at what parts he is to uncover afterwards during the ceremony. We shall give these directions as they occur under each rubric. They are the same, with one or two exceptions, as those given in the Roman Ritual regarding the use of the mitre when a bishop baptizes.[1] The priest may, if he chooses, wear his cap according to the directions thus given; but we think the silence of our rubric on the point is sufficient to show that there is no obligation of wearing the cap at any part of the ceremony.

§ LIV.—**Ita paratus accedat ad limen Ecclesiæ, ubi foris expectant qui infantem detulerunt.**

288. The priest thus vested, and preceded by the clerk or clerks, advances to the door or porch of the church, being careful to make the usual reverences in passing the high altar, or any other on his way. Those who present the child for baptism should be in waiting at the door, for the rubric clearly supposes that it is kept outside the church until it is introduced with the ceremony mentioned hereafter.[2] It may be brought, however, within the porch if there be one, as it is still outside the church.[3] The candidates for baptism were kept outside the church, or place of assembly of the Christians, even from the earliest times, as is proved from Tertullian, *De Cor. Mil.*, *cap.* 3, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 1, referred to by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which assigns the reason of the exclusion in these words: "The person to be baptized is carried, or, as also

[1] Vid. chap. viii. § iv.
[2] Chap. iv. § viii.
[3] Baruff., tit. x. n. 55.

"happens, conducted, to the door of the church, and is "strictly forbidden to enter, as unworthy to be admitted "into the house of God, until he shall have cast off the "yoke of the most degrading servitude, and devoted him- "self unreservedly to Christ the Lord, and to His most "just sovereignty".[1]

289. But what is to be done if there be no porch, and if the state of the weather, or other circumstances, should make a strict compliance with the rubric seriously inconvenient? In this case, we think, the child may be brought inside. Indeed this is expressly permitted by the Ritual of Toulon,[2] and by the rituals published for the use of several dioceses in Belgium; as those of Mechlin, Bruges, Ghent, etc., cited by De Herdt.[3] The child, however, should be kept near the door, for the only safe rule in this and other such cases is to adhere to the rubric, if not strictly, at least as far as circumstances will allow; and we shall see that after having entered the church, the priest and sponsors are required by the rubric to recite the "Credo" and "Pater Noster" *while they are going to the font.*[4]

§ LV.—**Interroget, nisi de his bene sibi constet, an sit suæ Parochiæ, masculus, an fœmina, an sit domi baptizatus et a quo, et quam rite, et qui sint compatres qui infantem tenerunt, pro eoque respondeant, quos pie ac decenter assistere, ac prout opus fuerit, pro baptizando ad interrogationes respondere admoneat.**

290. From what has been already stated, it is plainly

[1] Para. ii. cap. ii. n. 62. Vid. *Decret.* Benedicti XIII., supra, n. 243.
[2] Tit. ii. § i. [3] Par. vi. n. 5. i.
[4] Infra, chap. iv. § x.

the duty of the priest to ascertain all the particulars regarding the child presented for baptism, which he is here directed to ask, viz., whether it belongs to his parish, because, if not, he has, generally speaking, no right to baptize it;[1] its sex, because of the name to be given, and the gender to be used in the prayers, and because it is congruous, though not strictly required, that the sponsor, if there be only one, should be of the same sex;[2] whether it has received a private baptism, and from whom, that he may know whether he is now to baptize it absolutely, or conditionally, or at all;[3] who are the sponsors, that he may know whether they are admissible,[4] and that he may instruct them how to assist with becoming reverence, and to respond to the interrogations.

§ LVI.—**Et quoniam iis qui baptizantur, tamquam Dei filiis in Christo regenerandis, et in ejus militiam adscribendis, nomen imponitur, curet, ne obscœna, fabulosa, aut ridicula, vel inanium deorum, vel impiorum ethnicorum hominum nomina imponantur, sed potius, quatenus fieri potest, Sanctorum, quorum exemplis Fideles ad pie vivendum excitentur, et patrociniis protegantur.**

291. As in the ancient law, names were imposed in circumcision, so under the Christian dispensation names are given in baptism.[5] In the early ages, catechumens were required to give in their names, and have them inscribed on the register of the church for some time before receiving baptism.[6] From this it is inferred, with some

[1] Vid. supra, n. 194.
[2] Supra, n. 222.
[3] Supra, n. 174.
[4] Supra, n. 229.
[5] Baruff., tit. x. n. 64.
[6] Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. x.

probability, that the names given in baptism were frequently imposed or adopted long before.[1] It is certain, at all events, as Martene proves at length,[2] that the custom of giving a name in baptism prevailed from the beginning. The converts from paganism usually laid aside their old names and received others, while the children of Christian parents either had no names previously, or changed those they had for new ones, or at least had them again imposed and ratified in baptism.

292. The priest is directed by the rubric to take care that the name given be such as may become one who is regenerated in Christ and enlisted as His soldier. "To "the person baptized", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "is given a name, which should be taken "from some one, whose eminent piety and religion have "given him a place in the catalogue of the saints, for this "similarity of name will easily serve to stimulate to the "imitation of his virtues and the attainment of his holi- "ness, and to hope and pray that he who should be the "model of his imitation, may also, by his advocacy, be- "come the guardian of his safety of soul and body. "Wherefore, those are to be reprehended who so indus- "triously search for, and distinguish their children by the "names of heathens, of those particularly who were the "most conspicuous for their crimes, for they thus show "what little regard they have for the pursuit of Christian "piety, who seem to be so enamoured with the memory "of impious men, as to wish to have such profane names "everywhere echo in the ears of the faithful".[3]

[1] Martene, ibid. [2] Loc. cit.
[3] Para. ii. cap. ii. n. 76.

293. The names of the Old Testament were generally adopted by the heretics of modern times, especially by the Puritans, in preference to the names of Christian saints.[1] When one of these is converted, or when any adult, having a name not found in the calendar or martyrology, is about to receive baptism, there may be some difficulty about changing the name. The words of the rubric, as Baruffaldi observes,[2] do not imply a rigorous precept, but an admonition to the priest to do what he can to have every one baptized by the name of a saint; and should it happen that there are special reasons for giving or retaining another name—as in the case where an inheritance or a legacy might be made to depend on it, the priest need have no hesitation in allowing it. Indeed, it is justly observed by the same author,[3] that hardly a name can be thought of which has not been borne by some one of the faithful, now amongst the saints, though not mentioned in the calendar. At all events, a name that is insisted on, may be easily admitted, by adding or prefixing to it the name of a saint. The name received in baptism may be changed in confirmation; and, accordingly, many change the names they had, or take others in addition, when they are confirmed.[4]

§ LVII.—**His igitur expeditis, et accepto nomine baptizandi, positi, si infans fuerit, super brachium dextrum illius qui eum defert, Parochus ad baptismum procedat, in hunc modum nominatim interrogans.**

294. The infant to be baptized is placed so as to rest,

[1] Cfr. Catal., tit. ii. cap. i., § lvi. n. viii.
[2] Tit. x. n. 65. [3] Loc. cit. n. 66.
[4] Baruff., tit. x. n. 68. Catal., tit. ii. cap. i. § lvi. n. ix.

or be borne up, on the right arm of the person holding it; and this, as Baruffaldi states,[1] for the greater convenience of the minister, and because the right arm is reputed more honourable than the left. The Ritual of Toulon directs the child to be held by the godfather, the godmother being on his left, and holding it at the same time by the feet.[2] Catalani also supposes that it is held up by the godfather.[3] In Ireland it is usually held up by the godmother, the godfather standing at her right. The priest takes his place at the door opposite them, standing with his back turned to the high altar,[4] and with his cap on,[5] holding the ritual in his hand, or having it held before him by the clerk, proceeds with the ceremony as directed in the order.

[1] Tit. x. n. 70.
[2] Tit. ii. §. i. n. i.
[3] Cap. ii. § ix. n. ii. in fine.
[4] Rit. Leod. apud De Herdt, p. vi. n. 5. iii.
[5] Rit. Toul. l. c.

CHAPTER IV.

ORDER FOR THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

ORDO BAPTISMI PARVULORUM.

§ I.—N. *Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei?* **Patrinus respondet:** *Fidem.* **Sacerdos.** *Fides, quid tibi præstat?* **Patrinus respondet:** *Vitam æternam.* **Sacerdos.** *Si igitur vis, etc.*

295. The ceremonies prescribed by the ritual to be observed in baptism, have been in use from the earliest times, and most of them may be traced to the apostolic age, as is shown by abundant extracts from the Fathers and ancient liturgies, given by Catalani and Martene, but they were not always applied in the same order. It appears from the "Ordines" given by Martene,[1] that the unctions, insufflations, etc., in some ancient rituals precede, and in others follow, the interrogations or catechetical instructions on the doctrines of the Christian faith, of which a profession is to be made in baptism.

"This practice of instruction", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "originated, beyond all doubt, in "the command of our Lord addressed to His Apostles—

[1] *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii.

"'Go ye into the whole world, and teach all nations, bap-
"'tizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son,
"'and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all
"'things, whatsoever I have commanded you'; (*Matth.*,
"xxviii. v. 19, 20; *Mark*, xvi. v. 15); words from
"which we may learn that baptism is not to be admini-
"stered until at least the principal heads of our religion
"are explained. But, as the catechetical form consists
"of many interrogations, if the person to be instructed
"be an adult, he himself answers; but if he be an infant,
"the sponsor answers according to the prescribed form,
"and makes the solemn engagement for the child".[1]

In the present case, then, addressing the infant by its name, the priest says:—N. (*i.e.*, Joannes, Maria, etc.), *Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei?* The sponsor answers, *Fidem.* Priest: *Fides quid tibi præstat?* Sponsor: *Vitam aternam.* Priest: *Si igitur vis ad vitam ingredi*, etc., etc.

296. When a great many names are given to an infant, as it would be inconvenient to repeat them all every time the letter N. is marked in the ritual, the priest may follow the rule laid down by the Council of Baltimore.[2] In the first interrogation he may mention all the names if he thinks it expedient; but in the rest of the ceremony let him mention only what may be commonly known as the Christian name, taking care that all be inscribed in the baptismal register.[3]

297. According to Baruffaldi,[4] these questions are to be proposed in Latin, exactly as they are given in the

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 63, 64.
[2] Provinciale. i., Decr. xiii.
[3] Vid. Decret. in Appendice.
[4] Tit. x. n. 69, and tit. xi. n. 2.

ritual. But a custom has pretty generally prevailed, of proposing them in the vernacular, or at least of repeating them in the vernacular, since sponsors, for the most part, are unable to answer in Latin. The editions of the ritual used in Ireland, England, and America, give a translation of the questions and answers annexed to the Latin form. That which has been published for the use of the English Church, pursuant to a decree of the Synod of Westminster,[1] does not differ in this respect from those that preceded. The compendium published for the use of the clergy of the United States, likewise gives a translation of the questions in English, French, and German. This compendium[2] was published according to a decree of the third Provincial Council of Baltimore, with the approval of Gregory XVI.

It is worthy of note, that in the fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore it was directed that, in the edition of the ritual to be published, there should be inserted at the foot of the page a translation, approved by the Archbishop, of certain interrogations and prayers, so that it might be used when expedient—*the Latin form, however, never being omitted;* and, in the decree of the fifth council, which approved of the ritual published, the priests were strictly ordered. . . . "Latinam formam precum nunquam omittere".[3]

[1] Derby, 1856.

[2] "*Excerpta ex Rituali Romano pro administratione sacramentorum "ad commodiorem usum Missionariorum in Septentrionalis Americæ "Fœderatæ Provinciis*". Editio tertia, Baltimori, 1860.

[3] Decr. viii. q. v. in Appendice.

298. The Congregation of Rites has been several times consulted on this subject, and has invariably insisted on a strict adherence to the form given in the Roman Ritual. The last answer we have seen on the subject is given to a question proposed on the 12th September, 1857, and seems quite decisive against the lawfulness of translating the interrogations at all. "Utrum in collatione "baptismi interrogationes possint fieri vernacule, vel sal- "tem vernacule iterari postquam latinè factæ fuerint? "Resp.: Quoad interrogationes quæ baptismi ordinem "præcedunt vel sequuntur, ac pro quibus Rituale nullam "exhibet formulam: *Affirmative.* Quoad interrogationes "quæ in ipsomet baptismi ordine occurrunt, ac pro quibus "formulæ in Rituali extant: *Negative ad utramque par-* "*tem*".[1]

299. To proceed in strict conformity with this decision, no one should be admitted to act as sponsor who is not instructed to answer the interrogations in Latin; and this would, undoubtedly, cause great inconvenience and great dissatisfaction in places where the contrary practice has long prevailed. It is not impossible, however, that the decision may be intended to guard against the danger of introducing incorrect and unauthorized translations; and that, when a sponsor otherwise qualified is unable to answer the interrogations in Latin, it may still be lawful for the priest to repeat them in the vernacular, *according to an approved translation*, such as is given in the rituals above referred to.[2]

[1] 12 Sept., 1857, *in Molinen.* ad 17. apud Falise, *Decreta Authentica*, etc. v. *Baptisma.*

[2] Supra, n. 297.

300. But at least it is certain that the priest is never justified in simply *omitting* the Latin, and *substituting* a translation, in any of the interrogations or prayers of the ritual. The translation, when used, must be merely added "explicationis causâ". The whole of this is very well put in the following decree of the first provincial Synod of Baltimore: "Statuimus juxta Ritualis Romani præ-"scriptum, in sacramentis administrandis et in defunc-"torum sepulturâ, sacerdotes omnino teneri ad adhiben-"dam linguam Latinam: et si censuerint expedire, ex-"plicationis causâ, eorum quæ recitant adjungere versi-"onem linguâ vernaculâ, eam tantum versionem adhi-"bendam esse, quæ fuerit ab Ordinario sancita. Ubi-"cumque autem consuetudo aliqua invaluerit huic Decreto "adversa, eam quamprimum abrogandam statuimus".[1]

301. It may be well to observe that the National Synod (*Concilium Plenarium*), of the whole United States of North America, held at Baltimore in 1852, formally adopted the decrees of the seven provincial Synods of Baltimore, and declared them to be binding every where throughout the states and territories subject to the general government.[2]

§ II.—**Deinde ter exsufflet leniter in faciem infantis, et dicat semel:** *Exi ab eo* (**vel** *ab ea*), *immunde, etc.*

302. From the insufflations and exorcisms used before the baptism of infants, as well as before that of adults, St. Augustine proves original sin against the Pelagians;[3]

[1] Decr. xx. [2] Decr. ii.

[3] *Epistola* 194, ad Sixtum. *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, lib. i. cap. 5. cit. apud Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § ii. n. i.

and that they were used everywhere throughout the Church from the time of the Apostles, is placed beyond all doubt by this and the other testimonies cited by Martene.[1]

303. In reference to the ceremony mentioned in the present rubric, as well as to the exorcisms used in baptism generally, the Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—"The exorcism follows, which is composed of "words of sacred and religious import, and of prayers to "expel the devil, and to weaken and crush his power; "wherefore the priest breathes three times into the face "of him who is to be initiated, that he may expel the "power of the old serpent, and may catch the breath of "lost life".[2] This ceremony was not always performed by the bishop or priest who administered the sacrament, but often by a deacon, exorcist, or even a simple cleric.[3]

304. According to the rubric, the priest blows gently on the face of the child three times, and then says, once, *Exi ab eo*, etc. Baruffaldi[4] directs this to be done with the mouth fully open, "ore lato", and not with the mouth nearly closed, "ore stricto": in other words, he requires the priest to breathe, rather than blow gently; and this, that the air exhaled may not be too cold. We think, however, that the word in the rubric means to blow, as a person, *e.g.*, would blow dust off a book or paper. This is its ordinary meaning, and in the ceremony for baptizing adults, the rubric itself directs the

[1] *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. vi. n. viii.
[2] Pars ii. cap. ii. n. 65.
[3] Martene, l. c. n. ix.
[4] Tit. xi. n. 3.

priest first to blow, "**exsufflet**" and afterwards to breathe, "**halet**" on the face of the person to be baptized, thus plainly distinguishing between the two.[1]

§ III.—**Postea pollice faciat signum Crucis in fronte, et in pectore infantis, dicens:** *Accipe signum Crucis tam in fronte ✠ quam in corde ✠; sume Fidem cœlestium præceptorum; et talis esto moribus, ut Templum Dei jam esse possis. Oremus. Preces nostras, etc.*

305. The frequent use of the sign of the cross from the very commencement of Christianity, is proved by the testimony of the most ancient writers, and is admitted by Protestants themselves. It is enough to refer to the well-known passage of Tertullian,[2] in which he says:—"Ad "omnem progressum atque promotum: ad omnem adi- "tum et exitum; ad vestitum, calciatum, ad lavacra, ad "mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia; quæcumque "nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo teri- "mus". St. Augustine expressly mentions that the catechumens were signed with the sign of the cross before baptism,[3] and the same is inferred from St. Basil.[4]

306. The signing of several parts of the body shows, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that, by the mystery of baptism, the senses of the per- "son baptized are opened, and strengthened to enable "him to receive God, and to understand and observe his

[1] Vid. infra, chap. vi. § v.

[2] *Lib. de Corona Militis*, c. 3, cit. apud Perrone. *De Cultu Sanctorum*, cap. vi.

[3] *De Symb. ad Catech.*, lib. ii. cap. i., apud Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § iii. n. i.

[4] *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 27, apud Catal., ibid.

precepts".[1] As to the parts signed, there was a considerable diversity of usage in different churches from the earliest times,[2] and even still the pastorals or rituals of particular places direct signs to be made which are not mentioned in our rubrics.[3]

307. The priest should make the sign of the cross directed by the present rubric, with his right thumb (the other fingers being joined and extended), on the forehead at the word "*fronte*", and on the breast at the word "*corde*". He should make it in such a way that the first line be drawn downwards, and the other from right to left (of the child). This will naturally be the case if he stands as he ought, in front of the person holding the child.

308. The rubric does not say whether the breast of the child should be uncovered at this ceremony. De Herdt[4] here lays it down as a general rule, that when the parts to be signed are covered, it is sufficient to make the sign outside the dress; and he cites for this the rituals of Bruges, Liege, etc.

309. In reciting the prayer which follows—*Preces nostras*, etc.—the priest should be uncovered,[5] and remain so till after the blessing of the salt.

§ IV.—**Deinde imponat manum super caput infantis, ac dicat:** *Oremus. Omnipotens, etc.*

310. The imposition of hands on catechumens is a

[1] Par. ii. cap. ii. n. 67.
[2] Vid. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 5, v.
[3] Rit. Toul., tit. ii. § i. n. 3.
[4] Catal., cap. ii. § iii. n. ii.
[5] Loc. cit.

ceremony of great antiquity mentioned by Sulpiciu Severus, *De Vita Sti. Martini*, c. 10, and other ancien writers, cited by Martene.[1] It is also mentioned, witl the prayer which here accompanies it, in many ancien rituals given by the same author.[2]

The priest puts his right hand over the head of th child, having the fingers joined together and extended, and says the prayer, *Omnipotens*, etc. He may touc the head gently, as is directed by the ritual of Toulon; but this is not necessary, it is enough that the hand b extended over it.[5] He may keep it so extended durin the prayer, but the rubric does not require this.[6]

§ V.—**Deinde Sacerdos benedicit sal, quod semel bene dictum alias ad eumdem usum deservire otest. Benedictio Salis.** *Exorcizo te, creatura salis, etc.*

311. We need not repeat what has been already saic regarding the salt used in baptism.[7] It must be blessec according to the form given here. A very small quan tity, if carefully preserved from dust and moisture, woul suffice for a great many baptisms; and, of course, the bene diction here mentioned is omitted while the supply lasts In performing the ceremony the priest turns to the tabl where the salt to be blessed is already placed,[8] and

[1] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. vi. n. vii.
[2] Art. vii. ord. iv. v.
[3] De Herdt, pars. vi. r. 5. § vi.
[4] Tit. ii. § i. n. 4.
[5] Baruff., tit. xi. n. 9. De Herdt, l. c.
[6] Vid. infra. chap. vi. § xi. et § xxiii.
[7] Supra, n. 270–71. [8] Vid. supra, n. 274.

standing, with head uncovered and hands joined,[1] recites the prayer, making the sign of the cross over the salt at the words marked in the ritual; for which purpose he separates his hands, placing the left on the table or on his breast, and making the sign with the right.

312. In the rubrics of the Missal we have minute instructions as to the manner of making the sign of the cross in blessing any person or object. The right hand is to be stretched out, all the fingers being joined together and extended, and the little finger directed to the person or object to be blessed. In signing himself, the priest should always put his left hand below his breast; but in other benedictions, if he be at the altar, he should put his left hand on the altar. The words of the rubric as they are found in the missal,[2] are: "**Cum seipsum signat "semper sinistram ponit infra pectus; in aliis benedictionibus "cum est ad Altare, et benedicit oblata, vel aliquid aliud, "ponit eam super Altare, nisi aliter notetur. Seipsum "benedicens, vertit ad se palmam manus dextræ, et om- "nibus illius digitis junctis et extensis, a fronte ad "pectus, et ab humero sinistro ad dextrum, signum crucis "format. Si vero alios, vel rem aliquam benedicit, parvum "digitum vertit ei, cui benedicit, ac benedicendo totam "manum dextram extendit, omnibus illius digitis pariter "junctis, et extensis: quod in omni benedictione obser- "vatur**".

313. The rubric does not say where he should keep his left hand in blessing any object when he is not at the altar. If he be at a table, we are inclined to think from analogy, that he should put it on the table; in other circumstances, we think he should put it under his breast, for

[1] Rub. Missal. *Die.* iv. *Cinerum.* Vid. De Herdt, pars. v. n. 37, vii.
[2] *Rit. Celeb. Miss.*, iii. n. 5.

it would be very unbecoming to have it suspended in the air, as is observed by Merati on the above rubric. Besides, the rubric itself[1] directs the priest to put the left hand under the breast in giving the benediction before the last gospel, from which it may be, not unreasonably, inferred that he should do the same whenever he has nothing before him on which to rest it.

§ VI.—**Deinde immittat modicum salis benedicti in os infantis, dicens: N.** *Accipe sal sapientiæ: propitiatio sit tibi in vitam æternam.* **R.** *Amen.* **Sacerdos.** *Pax tibi.* **R.** *Et cum spiritu tuo. Oremus. Deus Patrum nostrorum, etc.*

314. After the blessing of the salt the priest puts on his cap,[2] and then, taking with the thumb and index finger of his right hand, a very small quantity—a few grains—of the blessed salt, he puts it into the mouth of the child, saying: "Jacobe, Catharina, etc, *Accipe sal*", etc. Baruffaldi observes that he must be careful to put in only very little, lest the child might be injured by it.[3]

The meaning of the ceremony is explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. "When salt", it says, "is put into the mouth of the person to be baptized, it "evidently imports, that by the doctrine of faith, and the "gift of grace, he should be delivered from the corruption "of sin, experience a relish for good works, and be de-"lighted with the food of divine wisdom".[4]

315. In reciting the prayer which follows: "*Deus pa-*

[1] *Rit. Celeb. Miss.*, xii. n. 1.
[2] Rit. Toul. tit. § i. n. 6.
[3] Tit. xi. n. 20.
[4] P. ii. cap. ii. n. 66.

trum nostrorum", etc., he should be uncovered[1] and keep his hands joined,[2] the clerk holding the ritual open before him.

At the end of the prayer he again puts on his cap,[3] and proceeds with the exorcism which immediately follows, keeping his hands joined, except when he makes the sign of the cross over the child (which he is to do with his right hand, placing the left hand on his breast),[4] while he pronounces the name of each of the persons of the Blessed Trinity as marked in the ritual.

§ VII.—**Hic pollice in fronte signat infantem, dicens:** *Et hoc signum, etc.*

316. A rubric is here inserted in the form of the exorcism, directing the priest to make the sign of the cross on the child's forehead, saying: "*Et hoc signum* "*sanctæ Crucis*", ✠ etc. It would not suffice to mark the cross in the text where it is to be made, because the sign is here to be made, not with the hand over the child, as in those immediately preceding, but with the thumb on the child's forehead in the manner before directed.[5]

317. De Herdt, speaking of the crosses marked in the missal as directions to make the sign at certain words, observes that the word or syllable which precedes the cross should be pronounced in the act of drawing the first line, and that which follows, in drawing the tranverse line.[6] This rule seems to express very well the direction implied

[1] Rit. Toul. tit. ii. § i. n. 6.
[2] Falise, *Cours Abrégé*, etc., 3^me^ part. chap. i. § iv. n. 3.
[3] Rit. Toul. l. c.
[4] Vid. supra, 313.
[5] Supra, n. 307.
[6] Para. i. n. 45, i. 4.

in the mark, and it would be well to follow it in practice. At least care should be taken that the words are pronounced, and the sign made, at morally the same moment.

§ VIII.—**Mox imponit manum super caput infantis, et dicit:** *Oremus. Æternam ac justissimam, etc.*

318. On this rubric we have only to repeat what has been said above.[1] He takes off his cap before extending his hand, and remains uncovered while reciting the prayer.[2]

§ IX.—**Postea Sacerdos imponit extremam partem stolæ super infantem, et introducit eum in Ecclesiam, dicens: N.** *Ingredere, etc.*

319. It is supposed that, up to this time, the child has been outside the church.[3] The priest is here directed to put the extremity of his stole over it, and thus in a manner lead it into the church, while he says the words: *Petre, Maria*, etc., *Ingredere in Templum*, etc.

320. This imposition of the stole, according to Baruffaldi,[4] signifies protection against the assaults of the demons. It is not prescribed in any of the ancient rituals. According to the Ambrosian ritual and the instructions of St. Charles,[5] the priest should not touch the child with the stole, but merely give a sign to have it enter, while he goes before, saying "*Ingredere fili in domum Dei*, "*audi Patrem tuum docentem te viam scientiæ*".[6]

[1] Supra, n. 310.
[2] Rit. Toul. tit. ii. § i. n. 8.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 288.
[4] Tit. xi. n. 22.
[5] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. § *Ordo Baptismi Parvulorum*, pag. 417.
[6] Cfr. Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § ix. n. ii.

321. Our rubric does not say which extremity of the stole is to be used. De Herdt recommends the left, (which is to be simply laid on the child's breast), in order, as he says, that the priest may be at the right in entering the church.[1] Indeed the left extremity is expressly mentioned by the rubric of the Pontifical in the ceremony of baptizing adults. This arrangement is very convenient if the child be carried by the god-father, for the priest could easily walk at the god-father's right, having the left extremity of the stole placed on the child; but it is not quite so convenient when the child is carried, as it usually is, by the god-mother. In this case the left side of the stole must be extended so that, passing in front of the god-father, it may reach the child.

322. He puts on his cap at the end of the preceding prayer, and wears it entering the church, but takes it off as soon as he has entered.[2]

§ X.—**Cum fuerint Ecclesiam ingressi, Sacerdos procedens ad fontem, cum Susceptoribus conjunctim clara voce dicit:** *Credo in Deum, etc.*

323. Many ceremonies not here mentioned were prescribed by several ancient rituals;[3] one, which was very common, is still retained according to the usage of certain churches—that of reading the Gospel, Matthew, chap. xi., from the 25th verse to the end; or, more commonly, Matthew, chap. xix., verses 13, 14, and 15; making, at the beginning, the sign of the cross on the child's fore-

[1] Pars. vi. n. 5. viii.
[2] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 9.
[3] Vid. Catal. § x. n. i. et seq.

head, lips, and breast, and putting the book to its lips at the end. This is still prescribed in many diocesan rituals in Belgium and other places on the Continent.[1]

The ritual of St. Ambrose, used in Milan, directs that the infant, after being brought into the church, be placed on the ground near to, and with its feet turned towards, the font, while the "Credo" and "Pater Noster" are recited by the minister and sponsors, looking towards the altar.[2]

324. According to our rubric, the priest having entered the church, must, while proceeding to the font, recite conjointly with the sponsors, and in a clear distinct voice, the "Apostles' Creed" and the "Pater Noster". A profession of faith was always required from those who were about to receive baptism, as is proved from the most ancient rituals and the testimony of several Fathers, and especially of St. Augustine.[3]

This is evidently in accordance with the institution of Christ, referred to by the Catechism of the Council of Trent already cited,[4] and is strikingly illustrated in the baptism of the eunuch by Philip.[5] Adults are required to make this profession themselves, but infants make it through their sponsors, as St. Augustine states in his work against the Donatists.[6]

325. The "Credo" and "Pater Noster" should be recited in Latin by the sponsors as well as by the priest. If they cannot recite them in Latin, they are usually permitted to recite them in the vernacular. How far this

[1] De Herdt, par. vi. n. 5. ix.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.* § *Ordo Baptismi Parvulorum*, pag. 417.

[3] *Confess.*, lib. viii. cap. ii. apud. Catal. § x. n. iii.

[4] Supra, n. 295. [5] Act. Apost., cap. viii.

[6] Lib. iv. cap. 24. apud. Catal. l. c. n. iv.

usage is to be tolerated may be inferred from what has been said regarding the interrogations.[1] The same decision may evidently be applied here.

§ XI.—**Ac deinde, antequam accedat ad Baptisterium, dicat: Exorcismus.** *Exorcizo te, etc.*

326. When they come near the baptismal font, if they have not yet finished the Pater Noster, they should turn towards the high altar, and remain standing until they conclude it.[2] Then the priest, having put on his cap,[3] turns towards the child, and reads the exorcism, making the sign of the cross in the manner already explained.[4]

§ XII.—**Postea Sacerdos digito accipiat de saliva oris sui, et tangat aures et nares infantis: tangendo vero aurem dextram et sinistram, dicat:** *Ephpheta, quod est, Adaperire:* **deinde tangit nares, dicens:** *In odorem suavitatis. Tu autem, etc.*

327. The ceremony of touching the catechumens with spittle, is clearly referred to by St. Augustine, *Tract* 44, *in Joannem*, speaking of the blind man whom our Lord restored to sight after having rubbed on his eyes clay mixed with spittle;[5] and by other Fathers, cited by Martene.[6] It is prescribed in many very ancient rituals given by the same author.[7]

[1] Supra, n. 297 et seq.
[2] Rit. Toul. tit. ii. § i. n. 9. Falise, *Sacr. de Baptême*, § iv. n. 3.
[3] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 10.
[4] Supra, n. 317.
[5] John, ix. 7.
[6] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. cap. i. art. vi. n. xvi.
[7] Art., vii. Ordo vi. Art. xviii. Ord. vi. et xviii.

328. The mystic signification is explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "His nostrils and "ears are next touched with spittle, and he is imme- "diately sent to the baptismal font, that, as sight was re- "stored to the blind man mentioned in the Gospel, "whom the Lord, after having spread clay over his eyes, "commanded to wash them in the waters of Siloe; so "also we may understand that the efficacy of the sacred "ablution is such, as to bring light to the mind to discern "heavenly truth".[1]

329. In performing this ceremony, the priest, still covered,[2] puts his right thumb to his lips, touching it with the point of his tongue, and having thus moistened it with saliva, touches the lobe of the right ear, saying: "*Ephpheta*"; that of the left, saying: "*quod est ada-* "*perire*"; then the nostrils, one after the other, saying: "*in odorem*" (at the right), "*suavitatis*" (at the left), and continuing, "*Tu autem*", etc. We believe this to be the most approved manner of performing the ceremony, for there is some diversity of opinion and practice regarding it. The rubric seems to be clear enough as to the manner of taking the saliva, but De Herdt observes[3] that several Belgian rituals direct it to be put first into the hollow of the left hand, and then taken with the thumb and index of the right. The same direction is found in the ancient ritual of Limoges, given by Martene.[4] In applying the saliva it is not necessary to make the sign of the cross with the thumb, this not being prescribed as it

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 68.
[2] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 11.
[3] Pars. vi. n. 5. x.
[4] Lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ordo. xviii.

is in anointing.[1] As to the parts of the ear to be touched, we may follow the rule given for Extreme Unction, in which all agree that the lobes are to be anointed.[2]

330. The above distribution of the words is the one given by De Herdt,[3] Falise,[4] and the Ritual of Toulon.[5] Baruffaldi says[6] that the words "*quod est adaperire*" may be omitted, as they are merely explanatory of the word "*Ephpheta*"; but in this he is followed by no other writer. He observes that they are printed in a different type. But, whatever was the case in his time, the "Propaganda" edition and all correct editions of the ritual at present give the words in the same type with the others.

The chief diversity is with respect to touching the nostrils. De Herdt[7] says both should be touched together; but Falise[8] and the Ritual of Toulon,[9] prescribe that they be touched, one after the other; and this, we think, is the more exact method, and the one usually followed in practice.[10]

§ XIII.—**Postea interrogat baptizandum nominatim, dicens: N.** *Abrenuntias Satanæ?* **Respondet Patrinus:** *Abrenuntio.* **Sacerdos.** *Et omnibus operibus ejus?* **Patrinus:** *Abrenuntio.* **Sacerdos.** *Et omnibus pompis ejus?* **Patrinus:** *Abrenuntio.*

331. After the preceding ceremony the priest wipes his thumb with a towel,[11] and having entered the baptis-

[1] De Herdt, l. c.
[2] Vid. chap. xvi. § xiii.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] *Du Sacrement de Baptême*, § iv. n. 3.
[5] Tit. ii. § i, n. 11.
[6] Tit. xi. n. 34.
[7] Loc. cit.
[8] Loc. cit.
[9] Loc. cit.
[10] Vid. inf. chap. xvi. § xiv.
[11] Rit. Toul. tit. ii. § i. n. 11.

tery, which is supposed to be railed off,[1] gets the holy oils in readiness and arranges the other requisites, if all be not already prepared, in the manner before explained.[2] In the meantime the nurse or god-mother uncovers the head, shoulders, and breast of the child.[3] The priest then standing with his face looking towards the high altar,[4] and having the sponsors with the child opposite him, puts the interrogations in Latin,[5] saying: "Joannes, "Catharina, *Abrenuntias Satanæ?*" etc.

332. This public and solemn renunciation of the devil immediately before baptism is expressly mentioned by Tertullian, *De Cor. Militis*, cap. iii., St. Basil, who says it is handed down by tradition, *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. xxvii., and other ancient authors cited by Catalani.[6] It was made by the catechumen standing and looking towards the west, and immediately after, he turned round with his face to the east.[7]

"In three distinct interrogatories", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the person to be baptized is "formally asked by the priest: 'Dost thou renounce "'Satan? and all his works? and all his pomps?' to each "of which he, or the sponsor in his name, replies: 'I "'renounce'. He, therefore, who is to be enrolled under "the banner of Christ, must first enter into a holy and "religious engagement that he abandons the devil and the "world, and will ever detest them as his worst enemies."[8]

[1] Supra, 243.
[2] Supra, 273 et seq.
[3] Rit. Toul. l. c.
[4] De Herdt, Pars. vi. i. n. 5. xii.
[5] Vid. supra, 297 et seq.
[6] Tit. ii. cap. ii. § xiii. n. i.
[7] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xiii. n. viii.
[8] Par. ii. cap. ii i. n. 69.

§ XIV.—**Deinde Sacerdos intingit pollicem in oleo Catechumenorum, et infantem ungit in pectore, et inter scapulas in modum Crucis, dicens:** *Ego te linio,* ✠ *etc.*

333. The priest now uncovers,[1] and having laid aside his cap, or given it to the clerk, dips his right thumb into the oil of catechumens, and anoints the child on the breast and between the shoulders, making the sign of the cross on each part with his thumb in applying the holy oil; and at the same time saying the words: "*Ego te linio*", etc.

334. Only a single cross is marked in the ritual, at least in any copy we have seen; but the words of the rubric are understood to imply that the sign is to be made on each of the parts in the act of anointing it. The mark is usually put between the words *linio* and *oleo*, thus; "*linio* ✠ *oleo*", from which it might, perhaps, be inferred, that both the unctions should take place while pronouncing these words, but, as the child must usually be turned for the unction between the shoulders, we think the pause between the words would be rather long. We should, therefore, prefer the distribution of the words which is given by the Ritual of Toulon,[2] viz., anointing the breast he says: "*Ego te linio* ✠ *oleo salutis*"; then anointing between the shoulders, he continues: "*in Christo Jesu* "✠ *Domino nostro ut habeas vitam æternam. Amen*".

335. The unctions in baptism have been in use from the earliest times,[3] but they were not always confined to the parts here mentioned. According to an ancient sacramentary cited by Catalani,[4] they were extended to the ears and nostrils; and in the Oriental Church the

[1] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 13.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Vid. supra, 248.
[4] Tit. ii. cap. ii. § xiv. n. iii..

whole body was anointed, as is expressly stated by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Myst.*, ii. n. 3, and St. John Chrysostom, *Hom.* 6 *ad Coloss.*, cited by Martene.[1]

336. The Euchologium still used in the Greek Church, prescribes the unction of the forehead, breast, back, (*τὰ μετάφρενα*, between the shoulders), ears, feet, hands, and lastly of the whole body, as may be seen in the "ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΜΕΓΑ".[2] The unction of the entire body is likewise prescribed in the several "Ordines" of the Greeks given by Martene, except the one that relates to baptism in necessity.[3]

337. The mystic meaning of the ceremony as now performed, is thus explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent.[4] "The person to be baptized is next "anointed with the oil of catechumens on the breast and "between the shoulders: on the breast, that by the gift of "the Holy Ghost, he may cast off error and ignorance, "and may receive the true faith, 'for the just man liveth "'by faith' (*Galat.*, iii. c., 11 v.); on the shoulders, that "by the grace of the Holy Spirit, he may shake off ne-"gligence and torpor, and engage in the performance of "good works; for 'faith without works is dead' (*James*, "chap. ii. v. 26).

Hic deponit Stolam violaceam, et sumit aliam albi coloris.

§ XV.—**Subinde pollicem et inuncta loca abstergit bombacio, vel re simili, et interrogat expresso nomine baptizandum, Patrino respondente. N.** *Credis in Deum etc.*

338. Immediately after the unctions the priest wipes

[1] Lib. i. cap. i. art. xiii. n. xi. [2] *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος.*
[3] Lib. i. cap. art. xviii. ordo xxii. et seq. [4] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 70.

his thumb and the part anointed with a little cotton or flax, or some similar material, which he should have at hand for the purpose.[1] According to the letter of the rubric, he first wipes his thumb; and this is certainly convenient, because, having the thumb free, he can more easily wipe the parts anointed. But we think it might be sometimes, and perhaps generally, more convenient to wipe the oil off the breast immediately after applying it; because otherwise there is danger of its coming in contact with the dress or the hand of the person holding the infant, in turning it for the unction between the shoulders, just as in Extreme Unction it is recommended to wipe the oil from the right ear, before anointing the left.[2]

339. After this he takes off the violet stole and puts on a white one. Violet is the colour used by the Church as expressive of sorrow and affliction; white, as expressive of joy and innocence.[3] Violet is therefore suited to the condition of the catechumen, and white to the state of the neophyte regenerated by baptism.[4]

The rubric directing the change is usually printed in small type in the margin as we give it; but in some editions it has been printed as a distinct paragraph in the same type as the rest, and immediately before "**Subinde pollicem**", etc. It is printed in this way in the edition published by order of Benedict XIV.,[5] which is that followed by Catalani. But in whatever way it be printed, it is right, as Catalani himself observes,[6] that the

[1] Vid. supra, n. 277.
[2] Vid. infra, chap. xvi. § xii.
[3] Gavant., pars. i. tit. xviii. *Rub.* 2 et *Rub.* 5.
[4] Baruff., tit. xi. n. 37.
[5] Romæ, 1752.
[6] Tit. ii. cap. ii. § xv. xvi. n. i.

priest should wipe off the oil before he changes the stole, as he could not conveniently do so without the use of his right thumb. If the stole which he has be a double one —violet on one side, and white on the other—he should reverse it.[1]

340. Having on the white stole, he puts the interrogations: "Joannes, Maria, etc.; *Credis in Deum* "*Patrem*", *etc.* The interrogations on the chief articles of the Creed were put to catechumens when they were just beside the font about to receive baptism, as appears from the ancient ceremonials cited by Martene.[2] They were often put so as to require a full and explicit profession of Catholic doctrine, in opposition to some spreading heresy of the time, as Arianism, Nestorianism, etc.[3]

341. The practice in these countries has been to put those questions in the vernacular, and Catalani says[4] that the vernacular should be used here, and also in the renunciations above mentioned, citing as his authority the statutes of St. Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz. But there can be no doubt that, according to the decision of the Sacred Congregation already cited, they are to be put in Latin, for that decision comprehends all the interrogations for which formulæ are given in the ritual.[5]

§ XVI.—**Subinde expresso nomine baptizandi, Sacerdos dicit: N.** *Vis baptizari?* **Respondet Patrinus:** *Volo.*

342. On this rubric it is enough to cite the words of

[1] Rit. Toul., tit. ii. § i. n. 14. Vid. supra, n. 279.
[2] Lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii.
[3] Catal. tit. ii. cap. ii. § xvi. n. vii.
[4] Loc. cit. n. x. [5] Vid. supra, 298 et seq.

the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "When the "sacrament is now to be administered, the priest asks the "person to be initiated if he will be baptized, and on "receiving an answer in the affirmative from him, or, if "an infant, from the sponsor, he immediately performs "the salutary ablution in the name of the Father, and of "the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; for as by voluntary obe- "dience to the serpent, man justly incurred sentence of "condemnation; so the Lord will have none but the "voluntary soldier enrolled under his banner, that by a "spontaneous obedience to the divine commands, he may "attain eternal salvation".[1]

§ XVII.—**Tunc Patrino, vel Matrina, vel utroque (si ambo admittantur) infantem tenente, Sacerdos vasculo, seu urceolo accipit aquam baptismalem et de ea ter fundit super caput infantis in modum Crucis, et simul verba proferens, semel tantum distincte, et attente dicit. N.** *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris,* ✠ **fundat primo,** *et Filii,* ✠ **fundat secundo,** *et Spiritus* ✠ *Sancti,* **fundat tertio.**

343. To act as sponsor validly, and contract the spiritual relationship, it is necessary to touch the child physically,[2] and hence both sponsors, when two are admitted, are here required to hold it while the priest pours on the water. It is held with the face downwards, and so that the water poured on the head may fall into the sacrarium, or the vessel destined to receive it, but by no means into the font.[3]

The ritual of Toulon directs that the godfather hold

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 72.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 181.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 226.

the child by the body, the godmother holding it by the feet.[1] But in places where it is usually held up by the godmother, the godfather is required merely to put his right hand on, or under the child's right shoulder, and this is as much as is required by the word "*tangit*", which is used in the canons, as well as "*tenet*", "*levat*", etc.[2]

344. The child being held in this manner, the priest takes the water out of the font with a ladle or ewer,[3] and pours it on the child's head, making with the little stream, as it falls on the head, the sign of the cross at the word *Patris*, another at the word *Filii*, and a third at the words *Spiritus Sancti;* being careful, as here directed, to pronounce the form distinctly and with attention.[4]

The priest then dries the child's head, rubbing it gently with a towel, which should be at hand for this purpose and used for no other.[5]

345. If the hair be thick, which, generally speaking, can happen only in the case of adults, it is a useful precaution to furrow the hair with the fingers of the left hand, while the water is poured on with the right,[6] for, should it touch the hair alone, and not the skin, the baptism would be at least doubtful.[7]

§ XVIII.—**Ubi autem est consuetudo baptizandi per immersionem, Sacerdos accipit infantem, et advertens ne lædatur, caute immergit, et trina mersione baptizat, et semel tantum dicit: N.** *Ego te baptizo, etc.*

346. We have already seen that immersion is the

[1] Tit. ii. § ii. n. 11. et n. 15.
[2] Supra n. 275.
[3] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 148.
[4] Vid. n. 167 et seq.
[5] Baruff., tit. xi. n. 44. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 5, xvii.
[6] De Herdt, n. 5. xvi.
[7] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 107. *Quær.* iii.

mode of baptizing still used throughout the Eastern Church. It is prescribed by the Ambrosian rite, and as such is still used at Milan.[1] It is in use also in the cathedral and parochial churches of Benevento, as we learn from the Pontificale Romanum;[2] but, we believe, in no other part of the Latin Church.

The following minute instructions as to the manner of baptizing by immersion are given by St. Charles.[3] "The priest takes the child from the sponsor with both "hands, having the right next the head, and keeping it "on its back with the face up (*supinum*); then he dips "the back part of the head (*occiput*), three times into the "water in the form of a cross, pronouncing the words "'N. *Ego te baptizo*'", etc.

The "Ordo" including this rubric is given at length by Martene,[4] as well as in the "Instructions" of St. Charles just cited. It is to be observed that in another paragraph of the same "Instructions", it is permitted to confer baptism by effusion on an infant in imminent danger of death.[5]

Great care, of course, must be taken, as our rubric directs, lest the child be in any way injured, as it easily might be, in this kind of baptism.

§ XIX.—**Mox Patrinus, vel Matrina, vel uterque simul infantem de Sacro Fonte levant, suscipientes illum de manu Sacerdotis.**

347. In the case of baptism by immersion, the sponsors

[1] Vid. Supra, n. 175 et seq.

[2] *Pontificalis Ritus pro Baptismo Adultorum.*

[3] *Acta Mediol. Eccles.*, para. iv. § *Ordo Baptismi Parvulorum*, pag 417.

[4] Lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ord. xxi.

[5] § *De modo administrandi Baptismum*, pag. 411.

do not hold the child while it is being immersed, but they receive it from the hands of the priest after it has been immersed, as the rubric here directs, and it is from this circumstance they are said "*suscipere*", "*levare de sacro fonte*", etc., while they are said "*tenere*", "*tangere*", etc., from what they are required to do in baptism by effusion.

§ XX.—**Si vero dubitatur an infans fuerit baptizatus, utatur hac forma:** N. *Si non es baptizatus, etc.*

348. Under a preceding rubric we have treated of the conditional form, and the circumstances in which it is to be used,[1] and we need not repeat what has there been said on the necessity of careful inquiry in every case of doubt.

§ XXI.—**Deinde intingit pollicem in sacro Chrismate et ungit infantem in summitate capitis in modum Crucis, dicens:** *Deus Omnipotens, Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui te regeneravit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, quique dedit tibi remissionem omnium peccatorum* (**hic inungit**), *ipse te liniat Chrismate salutis* ✠ *in eodem Christo Jesu Domino nostro in vitam æternam.* **R.** *Amen.* **Sacerdos.** *Pax tibi.* **R.** *Et cum spiritu tuo.*

349. The child's head having been dried, the priest dips his right thumb into the little vessel of chrism, and saying the prayer *Deus Omnipotens*, etc., anoints the crown of the head in the form of a cross, at the words: "*ipse te liniat Chrismate salutis* ✠ *in eodem*", etc.

We have already treated of this vertical unction with

[1] Supra, 173–174.

chrism, its antiquity, and the probable cause of its introduction.[1] Here we shall merely add the explanation of the ceremony given by the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "The person being now baptized, the priest "anoints with chrism the crown of his head, to give him "to understand that from that day he is united as a "member to Christ, his head, and ingrafted on his body; "and that therefore is he called a Christian from Christ, "but Christ from chrism. St Ambrose observes that "what indeed the chrism signifies, the prayers then offered "by the priest sufficiently explain".[2]

§ XXII.—**Tum bombacio, aut re simili abstergit pollicem suum, et locum inunctum, et imponit capiti ejus linteolum candidum loco vestis albæ, dicens:** *Accipe vestem, etc.*

350. Here, as well as after the unction with the oil of catechumens,[3] he uses only a little cotton or other such material for removing the oil; but at the end of the ceremony he uses crumbs of bread, to rub off any that might still adhere to his fingers.[4]

351. According to Martene, a small veil or fillet was formerly tied on the head of the baptized immediately after the unction with chrism.[5] Baruffaldi[6] says this was in use till the end of the eleventh century, when the practice was introduced of rubbing off the chrism immediately after its application, as here directed in the rubric.

[1] Vid. supra, n. **248.**
[2] Pars ii. cap. ii. n. 73.
[3] Supra n. **338.**
[4] Vid. infra, § xxiv.
[5] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. vi.
[6] Tit. xi. n. 52.

Catalani, however, on the present rubric[1] maintains that there was no veil or fillet in use distinct from the white garment which is here mentioned; otherwise, he says, there should be a special form to be used in putting it on, whereas there is no form prescribed but the one, *Accipe vestem*, etc. This reason does not appear to be of great weight. The distinct veil is prescribed in the order for the baptism of adults, as Catalani himself observes in his commentary on the rubric that refers to it,[2] and yet no form is there given, except the *Accipe vestem*, etc.[3]

This veil was probably of the same kind as that which is ordered by the rubric of the Pontifical, to be tied on the head after confirmation, and which, according to ancient usage, was worn for seven days,[4] though the time was afterwards shortened, and in the end it became usual to dispense with the bands altogether, and to wipe off the chrism immediately after the bishop conferred the sacrament.[5]

352. The newly baptized were clothed in white garments, which they continued to wear for some time after baptism, as is expressly mentioned by St. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, cap. 7, St. Augustine, *serm.* 223. *qui est* 5 *in Vig. Pasch.*, and other ancient writers cited by Martene.[6] The vigils of Easter and Pentecost were, as we have seen,[7] the great days fixed for the solemn administration of

[1] Tit. ii. cap. ii § xxiii. n. iv.

[2] Tit. ii. cap. iv. § liii. n. i. et ii.

[3] Vid. infra, chap vi. § xxxviii.

[4] Catalani, *Pontificale Romanum Commentariis Illustratum*, pars prima, tit. i. § viii. n. i.

[5] Catal., ibid, n. ii.

[6] Art. xv. n. v.

[7] Supra, n. 235.

baptism. The neopyhtes wore the white garments in which they were clothed on Easter eve, until the Saturday following, which from this circumstance was called "Sabbatum in Albis", the next day being called "Dominica in Albis", probably because they did not lay aside the white garments until after the Sunday.[1] It is highly probable that the name "Whitsunday" or "Whitsuntide", by which Pentecost Sunday is known in England, owes its origin in like manner to the white garments worn by those who were baptized on the vigil.[2]

353. We have a vestige of this ancient observance in the ceremony prescribed by the present rubric, as indeed the rubric itself clearly indicates, when it says that the "**linteolum candidum**" is "**loco vestis albæ**". A small piece of clean linen serves for the purpose; and it is usually presented by the parents or sponsors, but to guard against disappointment there should always be one in the baptistery.[3]

"The Holy Fathers teach", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that this symbol signifies the glory of "the Resurrection, to which we are born again by "baptism; the brightness and beauty with which the "soul purified from the stains of sin is invested in "baptism; and the innocence and integrity which the "person baptized should preserve through life".[4]

[1] Fornici, *Inst. Liturg.*, pars. ii. cap. 40. *De temp. Paschali.* Vid. Catal., *Rituale Romanum*, etc., tit. ii. cap. iv. § liv. n. iv.

[2] Wheatly, *Book of Common Prayer*, etc., chap. v. sect. xxiii. § 2.

[3] Baruff., tit. x. n. 45.

[4] Pars. ii. c. ii. n. 74.

§ XXIII.—**Postea dat ei, vel Patrino, candelam accensam, dicens:** *Accipe lampadem, etc.*

354. The priest then puts into the hand of the infant, or if he cannot do so conveniently, gives to be held by the sponsor,[1] a lighted candle, saying "*Accipe lampadem*", etc. Reference is made by several ancient writers to the lights which the neophytes carried in their hands immediately after baptism,[2] and the present ceremony is what still remains of that ancient usage in the baptism of infants.

355. Some rituals, as that of Ghent,[3] require the candle to be lighted from the commencement of the ceremony. This, however, is not prescribed by our rubric, which merely requires that it be lighted when it is presented.[4] The words of the priest, in presenting it, contain an evident allusion to the parable of the virgins, who "taking "their lamps went out to meet the bridegroom and the "bride";[5] and the mystic meaning is thus explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "A lighted candle "is next put into the hand, showing that faith inflamed "by charity, and received by him in baptism, is to be fed "and augmented by the pursuit of good works".[6]

§ XXIV.—**Postremo Sacerdos dicit. N.** *Vade in pace, etc.*

356. This parting salutation is supposed by some to

[1] De Herdt, par. vi. n. 5. xx. Rit. Toul. tit. ii. § i. n. 20.
[2] Cfr. Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. ix.
[3] Cit. apud. De Herdt, l. c.
[4] Vid. supra, n. **283.**
[5] Matthew, chap. xxv. ver. 1.
[6] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 75.

be derived from the ancient custom mentioned by St. Cyprian,[1] according to which the minister gave a kiss to the newly baptized, immediately after conferring the sacrament. Martene, however, found no mention of it in any other ancient writer, and supposes it to have been peculiar to the African Church.[2] Whatever may have been its origin, it is, at all events, a very appropriate conclusion of the ceremony.

357. The priest should now take the piece of cotton or other material used in wiping the parts anointed, and have it burned on a metal dish, or in some other way, so that the ashes may be thrown into the sacrarium; he should do this himself, unless there be some other in holy orders to do it for him.[3] Then he rubs his thumb and any other finger that may have touched the holy oil, with the crumbs of bread, which a preceding rubric directs to be in readiness,[4] and washes his hands, taking care that the water used in washing them be afterwards thrown into the sacrarium.[5] After this he closes the font and puts the holy oils into the place where they are kept.[6] In the meantime the child will have been dressed, and he should then proceed with the admonitions as directed below.[7]

358. The Ritual of Toulon[8] directs that, before the admonitions, the infant be presented at one of the altars of the church, where the priest, placing the right extremity of the stole over its head, reads the beginning of St.

[1] *Ep.* 59 *ad Fidum*, apud Martene, art. xv. n. i.
[2] Loc cit.
[3] Rit Toul., tit § i. n. 20.
[4] Supra, n. 280.
[5] Rit. Toul., l. c. De Herdt, n. 5. xxi.
[6] Rit. Toul., l. c.
[7] Infra, § xxix. et seq.
[8] Loc. cit.

John's Gospel: "*In principio erat verbum*", etc. This is also prescribed in the ancient ritual of Limoges, given by Martene,[1] and was a usual ceremony in many places.[2] The practice is still observed in several dioceses of France, according to Cardinal Gousset;[3] but it is evidently unauthorized by the Roman Ritual, and can be justified only by special indult, or by custom in the sense before explained.[4]

§ XXV.—**Si vero fuerint plures baptizandi, sive masculi, sive fœminæ, in Catechismo masculi statuantur ad dexteram, fœminæ vero ad sinistram; et omnia pariter dicantur ut supra in proprio genere, et numero plurali. Verum prima nominis interrogatio, exsufflatio, Crucis impressio, seu signatio, tactus aurium et narium cum saliva, abrenuntiationis interrogatio, unctio Olei Catechumenorum, interrogatio de Fide seu Symbolo, et ipse Baptismus, inunctio Chrismatis, candidæ vestis impositio, atque accensæ candelæ traditio, singulariter singulis, et primum masculis, deinde fœminis fieri debent.**

359. Baruffaldi seems to think that this rubric is practically of very little importance, for, according to him, nothing short of urgent necessity, as in the case of the conversion of a multitude of infidels, would justify a priest in baptizing a number together in the manner here contemplated: "Nonnisi urgentissima causa hæc Rubrica "et ejus Regulæ sunt adhibendæ", etc.[5] This opinion is not maintained by any other writer of note; and it has

[1] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ordo. xviii.
[2] Vid. Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § xxv. Append. n. xii.
[3] Vol. ii. n. 101. in fine.
[4] Vid. supra, chap. i. n. 76, et seq.
[5] Tit. xi. n. 56.

evidently no foundation in the rubric. The rubric makes no such restriction, but simply directs what is to be done when a number are presented for baptism at the same time.

Baruffaldi cites Clericatus in favour of his opinion, but on referring to Clericatus in the part cited,[1] it will be seen that he speaks of the case in which the sacrament is conferred on a number together "*unica vice et sub unica* "*forma*"; and this, he says, though valid, is illicit, being prohibited by the Church, unless in case of urgent necessity,[2] though she permits the exorcisms and other prayers to be recited for a number together in the plural. And he gives in proof of the permission this very rubric of the ritual, "**si vero**", etc.

360. A priest need have no hesitation, therefore, in availing himself of this rubric in order to shorten the ceremony, whenever a number of children are to be baptized together. There is no good reason why he should not, any more than there is, why he should not avail himself of the similar rubrics, when a number of adults are to be baptized together,[3] or than there is why a bishop should not avail himself of the like rubrics in the Pontifical, which are very clear and explicit on this matter.[4]

361. There is some difficulty, however, in determining the exact meaning of the rubric when we come to apply it to the several parts of the "Ordo". The most satisfactory way of explaining it, perhaps, is to go through the

[1] *De Baptismo*, Decis. xxxiv. num. 1–8. edit. Ancona, 1757.

[2] Vid. supra, cap. iii. § xxiii. [3] Vid. infra, chap. vi.

[4] Vid. *Pontif. Rit. Pro Baptismo Parvulorum*, et *Pontif. Rit. Pro Baptismo Adultorum* in Pontificali Romano.

entire "Ordo", and point out in detail, as well as we can, the changes that are to be made. We shall take as our guide in this the rubrics of the "Ordo Baptismi Adultorum", which, as we shall see, are very explicit on most points,[1] and those of the "Pontificale Romanum", which professedly give in detail the directions that are indicated here only in general terms.[2]

362. First of all, when children of both sexes are to be baptized, the males are placed on the right, and the females on the left—that is, as the rubric is usually understood, the males are placed on the right of the females, though there are reasons for understanding it differently.[3] The priest, then, vested and attended as before explained, comes to the door or porch of the church, where the sponsors with the infants ought to be in waiting.[4]

363. Commencing with the first of the male children, he puts the interrogations, N. *Quid petis, etc.?* in the singular number, and proceeds exactly as in the baptism of one as far as the words "*ut templum Dei jam esse possis*", inclusively. He does the same with the next in order, and so on to the last on his extreme right. This is the order to be followed in baptizing a number of adults, according to the rubric of the Ritual.[5] It is also the order to be observed according to the rubrics of the Pontifical.[6]

An order of baptism for a number of infants together

[1] Infra, chap. vi. § ii. et seq.
[2] Vid. Pontif. Rit. "*Pro Baptismo Parvulorum*", Rubricas in fine.
[3] Vid. chap. vi., § viii.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 288 et seq.
[5] Vid. chap. vi. § viii.
[6] *Pro Baptismo Parvulorum.*

is given at full length in the "Epitome Ritualis Romani", published for the use of the clergy in Scotland.[1] It has the question, "*Fides quid* VOBIS *præstat?*" and the exhortation, "*Si igitur* VULTIS", etc., addressed to all in common. We don't know what authority this "Epitome" may have, but, in this point, it does not accord with the Ritual or Pontifical.

364. Then he says the prayer, "*Preces nostras*", etc., for all in common and in the plural number. This prayer is expressly directed to be said in the plural for a number of adults,[2] and the rubric of the Pontifical, "Pro Baptismo Parvulorum" has in brackets the words "**In plurali pro omnibus**", immediately before it.

365. For "*hunc electum tuum*", "*hos electos tuos*" should be substituted in every case except that in which all are females, when the words, "*has electas tuas*" are used, and the same rule is to be observed for the similar changes in the other prayers. The rubric of the Pontifical is very explicit on this: "**Quod si fuerint masculi et fœminæ "simul baptizandi, omnia dicantur in numero plurali, sed "in genere masculino, etiam si sint plures fœminæ quam "masculi**".[3]

366. It may be asked whether the names of all should be distinctly mentioned where the letter N. occurs in the prayers. We have seen no authority on the question, but we think they ought; at least, we take this to be most in accordance with the rubric. If the number, however, be very great, so that the names could not easily be remembered, we are inclined to think they may be

[1] Glasgow: Margey. 1859.
[2] Infra, chap. vi., § xi.
[3] *Pro Bapt. Parv.* in fine.

omitted. Of course the name is always mentioned in the interrogations, for these are put "**singulariter singulis**".[1]

367. We have already seen that the imposition of the hand prescribed by the rubric does not require physical contact;[2] and hence it might be inferred that, in the present case, it is enough to extend the hand over all in common. Besides, "**manus impositio**" is not mentioned amongst the ceremonies to be applied "**singulariter singulis**", from which De Herdt infers that it may here be applied to all in common.[3] We had no doubt about the correctness of this conclusion till we referred to the rubric of the Pontifical, which distinctly prescribes that the hand be imposed here "**singulariter singulis**". This must be looked on as decisive, however specious the above reasons may be, for the Pontifical[4] professes to give in the proper places the directions which are put together here in the ritual; and there is no reason to suppose that the ceremony as performed by a Bishop, differs, in this point, from the ceremony when performed by a priest.

368. Having, then, imposed his hand on the head of each, he says the prayer, "*Omnipotens sempiterne*", etc., for all in common. This prayer is preceded in the Pontifical by the notice "**In plurali pro omnibus**", and in the "Order for Adults" it is directed to be said in the plural for a number.

369. No change is made in the blessing of the salt. It is administered to each separately with the words, N. *Accipe*, etc. . . *Pax tecum*, etc.

[1] Vid. supra, n. **296**. [2] Sup., n. **310**. [3] **Pars. vi. n. 7.**
[4] *Pro Bapt. Parvul.*, in fine. [5] Vid. infra., chap. vi. § xi.

370. Then the prayer "*Deus Patrum*", etc., is said for all in the plural, and so is the exorcism as far as the words, "*vocare dignatus est*", the remaining words, "*Et hoc signum*", etc., being said in the singular while the sign of the cross is being made on the forehead of each. All this is distinctly prescribed in the Pontifical.[1]

371. The prayer, "*Æternam ac justissimam*", etc., is said for all in common, but, before it, the priest is to impose his hand on the head of each separately, as is prescribed hereafter in the Order for Adults,[2] and as is here marked in the Pontifical.[3]

372. Then placing the left extremity of his stole on the first of the children, or, if there be only two or three, placing it so that it may touch each of them,[4] he introduces all into the church, saying in the plural: N. et N., etc., *Ingredimini*, etc.

373. Having recited the "Creed" and "Pater noster", with all the sponsors advancing towards the font, before entering the baptistery, he says the exorcism for all in common. "*Exorcizo te . . ab his plasmatibus*", etc.

374. He touches with saliva the ears and nostrils of each, saying, "*Ephpheta*", etc. In the present case it would be convenient to adopt the method before mentioned[5] of putting some saliva in the hollow of the left hand. He would thus avoid the necessity of putting the thumb to his lips after having used it in applying the saliva to the first child.

375. Having dried his fingers with a towel, he then

[1] Rub. in loc.
[2] Infra, chap. vi., § xxiii.
[3] Rub. in loc.
[4] Vid. chap. vi., § xxiv.
[5] Supra., n. 329.

interrogates each, N. *Abrenuntias*, etc., and, this done, he anoints each with the oil of catechumens, on the breast and between the shoulders, saying, "*Ego te linio*", etc.

376. Having then wiped his thumb and the parts anointed, he changes his stole, and proceeds to interrogate on the creed, and baptize them one by one.

377. When all are baptized, he applies the vertical unction to each, and after he has applied it to all, he removes the oil from his thumb.

He then presents the white garment and the lighted candle, and gives the parting salutation, "*Vade*", etc., to each in succession, and concludes with the admonitions to the sponsors and parents, etc., in common.

378. For those who are often required to baptize a number together, it would be very convenient to have the "Ordo" with all the changes given at full length. In defect of this, we would recommend them to note the changes in the margin of the common "Ordo" in the ritual which they use.

§ XXVI.—**Si infans, vel adultus ægrotus adeo graviter laboret, ut periculum immineat ne pereat antequam Baptismus perficiatur, Sacerdos, omissis quæ Baptismum præcedunt, eum baptizet, ter, vel etiam semel infundens aquam super caput ejus in modum Crucis, dicens:** *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris* ✠ *etc.*

379. In case of necessity, or when there is danger that the person to be baptized may die before the preceding ceremonies could be completed, all that precedes the baptism itself, that is, all that precedes the application of the matter and form of the sacrament, should be omitted:

and the priest should at once pour on the water and pronounce the form in the manner before explained.[1]

380. If the danger be very imminent, it is enough to pour on the water once, as the triple ablution is not essential,[2] and it is hardly necessary to observe with Baruffaldi[3] that the two ablutions omitted are not to be afterwards supplied.

381. The case here provided for might occur even in the church itself, as, *e. g.*, when an infant that has been brought to the church is observed to be in danger of death. In such circumstances, the priest should at once put on the white stole and commence by pouring on the water, proceeding (unless the infant be dead) with the other ceremonies to the end, as directed in a following rubric.[4] Then, if the infant be yet living, and if it be not necessary to remove it from the church to apply remedies or the like, he puts on the violet stole, and supplies what has been omitted in the manner prescribed hereafter.[5] This we take to be the order he should follow, for the rubrics here are quite general, comprising every case in which it may be necessary to commence by applying the matter and form.

382. When a priest, however, is called on to baptize in a case of necessity, in a private house, or in any other place than the church, it is certain that he is not allowed to perform any of the ceremonies which precede the application of the matter and form, even though there be no danger of the infant's death until all the ceremonies

[1] Supra., n. **344.**
[2] St. Lig. lib. vi., n. 107. *Quær.* v.
[3] Tit. xi., n. 60.
[4] Infra., § xxviii.
[5] Chap. vii.

could be completed. He should vest in a white stole, and after pouring on the water, apply the ceremonies which follow, leaving those that precede, and for which the violet stole is worn, to be afterwards supplied in the church. This has been expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation.[1] What exceptions may be admitted we shall consider under the next rubric.

§ XXVII.—**Si non habeatur aqua baptismalis, et periculum impendeat, Sacerdos utatur aqua simplici.**

383. If the baptismal water be at hand or can be easily procured, it ought to be used, as, *e.g.* when the case of necessity arises in the church itself, or in a house near it. Many hold that, even in private baptism, there is an obligation *sub gravi* of using consecrated water when it can be had. Gury,[2] citing the Salmanticenses and others, thinks this the more probable opinion. But St. Liguori,[3] Lacroix,[4] and others whom they cite, hold the contrary. St. Liguori says:[5] "In baptismo privato probabile est "licere uti aqua non consecratâ". It is practically certain, then, that the obligation of using consecrated water in private baptism is at most *sub veniali*, but all are agreed that it is at least laudable to use it when it can be had.

De Herdt maintains[6] that no one who has not at least deacon's orders is permitted to baptize with consecrated water. But the authors we have just cited make no

[1] 23 Sept. 1820. *In Calagur et Calceat.*, n. 4572.
[2] Vol. ii., n. 253.
[3] Lib. vi., n. 102, *in parenth.*
[4] Lib. vi., par. i., n. 263.
[5] *Hom. Apost.* Tract. xiv. n. 8.
[6] Pars. vi., n. 3, ii.

distinction as regards the minister, and seem to apply the same rule whether a priest or laic administers the private baptism. St. Liguori, citing the opinion of Collet, says that "baptismus adhuc necessitate domi conferendus, "debet curari, ut fiat aqua benedicta sive lustrali ob "majorem decentiam".[1] It rarely happens that any other than a priest can get consecrated water, since the font is kept locked;[2] but in case it can be had, we think it should be used even by a laic.

When baptismal water cannot be had, the rubric here says that he may use common water. Collet[3] recommends the use of holy water in such circumstances, as more becoming and approximating more to the practice of the Church. St. Liguori, in the words just cited, seems to approve of this. It would appear from a statement in the "Révue Théologique",[4] that the use of holy water in private baptism by laics is common in France and Belgium. But, whatever may be said of local usages, it is evident from our rubric that, at least, there is no general obligation to use holy water, or any other than common water, when baptismal water is not at hand.

384. It is not permitted, unless in virtue of special faculties, to bless baptismal water anywhere except in the church.[5] We have already seen[6] that the baptismal font should be blessed according to the form prescribed in the missal, on Holy Saturday and the eve of Pentecost. At any other time, should the font be exhausted, it ought to be

[1] Loc. cit. n. 102, in fine. [2] Vid. sup., n. 247.
[3] *De Baptismo*, cap. iii., Art. i., "*Qui domi in necessitate*", etc.
[4] IV^me^ Serie, pag. 24.
[5] Or Baptistery, vid. supra, n. 239. [6] Supra, n. 159.

blessed according to the form given in the ritual,[1] and the rubrics of this form clearly imply that the ceremony takes place in the church. Even when, by special permission, baptism is solemnly administered in a private oratory, the water is not to be blessed there, but to be carried from the font of the parochial church.[2] The present rubric provides for the case in which a priest baptizes in necessity and has not baptismal water, and it tells him that in this case he is to use common water. There is no rubric, then, or general law, as far as we know, which requires, or even allows, a priest to bless water for baptism outside the church.

385. In missionary countries, however, and in places where there are no baptismal fonts, special faculties are granted, in virtue of which baptism is usually administered with all the ceremonies in private houses, and the water blessed for the occasion, if there be not a supply of what had been previously blessed.

386. During the operation of the penal laws, and until very recently, such a custom prevailed pretty generally in Ireland and England. But measures were adopted by the Synod of Thurles[3] and the first Synod of Westminster[4] to abolish the custom wherever the provisions of the ritual regarding the place of baptism could be conveniently carried out.

387. "Ob præteritorum temporum calamitates", says the Synod of Thurles, "usus in hanc regionem inductus "est Baptisma in domibus privatis conferendi. Cum sine

[1] Infra, chap. ix.
[2] Supra, n. 241.
[3] *De Baptismo*, 7° 8°.
[4] Dec. xvi., *De Baptismo*, n. 4.

"magno incommodo in pluribus locis hæc consuetudo "aboleri nunc possit, præcipimus ut in locis prædictis "hoc sacramentum in Ecclesiis, in posterum conferatur. "Quod si infantes in periculo mortis sint, aut si longe "degunt ab Ecclesiis, ita ut ad eas tuto ferri non possint, "tunc morem jam inductum necessitas mutari non "sinit".[1] This decree must be understood of baptism with the ceremonies before, as well as after, the application of the matter and form, for this is the baptism which was conferred in private houses according to the custom. It is plain from the words that the old custom may still be retained: 1° in places where it cannot be abolished "sine magno incommodo", and of this the Bishop in each diocese must, of course, be the judge; 2° when a priest is called on to baptize an infant in danger of death, or at a great distance from the church.

388. The Synod of Westminster also, while prescribing the observance, generally, of the law of the Ritual, excepts the case in which baptism is administered at a station remote from the church or chapel, and visited by the priest either at stated times or when he is called on.[2] In such circumstances baptism is still administered with all the ceremonies, "*extra ecclesiam*".

389. The custom prevailing in the United States of America was pretty nearly the same as in England and Ireland. The decree of the first provincial Synod of Baltimore, referring to the custom, directs that care be taken as far as possible to have the sacrament of baptism

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Loc. cit. Vid. Decr. in Appendice.

conferred in the church, but leaves it entirely to the Bishops and missionary priests to determine the circumstances in which such a regulation might be enforced.[1]

It is worthy of note that the decree, in its first form, ordered that, in towns where there is a church, baptism be administered only in the church, but was altered to its present form by direction of the Sacred Congregation. The words, which will be found with the decree in the appendix, are important as showing clearly that the Sacred Congregation is unwilling to interfere suddenly with an established usage, even when that usage is opposed to the provisions of the Rubric regarding the administration of the sacraments.

390. When a priest, then, in any of these exceptional cases, baptizes solemnly, it may be asked, what kind of water he should use. Of course, if he can get water from the baptismal font, he should use it;[2] but, if not, is he to bless water for the baptism in the place where he is? We are inclined to think he should; for the water used ought to be consecrated water, if it can be conveniently obtained, even when baptism is conferred without the solemnities, as is plain from what has been said; and there is, evidently, a still stronger reason why it should be blessed, when baptism is conferred, as we here suppose it to be, with all the solemnities, though outside the church, for it is really that "baptismus solemnis", in which, according to the common opinion, there is an obligation, *sub mortali*, of using blessed water.[3] "Curan-

[1] Decr. xvi. q. v. in Appendice. [2] Supra, n. 383.
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 141. Vid. supra, n. 158.

"dum est", says Benedict XIV., "ne, extra casum "necessitatis justique timoris ab infidelibus incussi, "communis et naturalis aqua, vel etiam ea quæ pro "lustrationibus benedicitur, in baptismi administratione "adhibeatur, ac temere omittatur usus aquæ ad hunc "præcise effectum benedictæ juxta præscriptum Ritualis "Romani".[1] Now, we are much mistaken, if the same custom which justifies the administration of baptism with the solemnities in a private house, or any where outside the church, does not justify also the blessing of baptismal water in the same place, when a supply cannot be had from the font.

391. The form of blessing to be used in such circumstances is that which is prescribed in the ritual,[2] unless in places where the use of a shorter form is allowed by special indult.

392. In the United States of America the form used is one prescribed by the first Council of Baltimore, and approved by Pius VIII. We give in the appendix the form as published in the Ritual for the use of the American clergy.[3] It will be seen that, though very short, it does not dispense with the infusion of the holy oils.

393. In an epitome of the Roman ritual published for the use of the clergy in Scotland[4] there is an abbreviated form in which there is no mention of the infusion of the oils. A form similar to this was in use in some parts of Ireland before the Synod of Thurles. It consisted simply of the prayers prescribed by the Roman

[1] Constit. *Inter omnigenas*, § 20.
[2] Infra, chap. ix.
[3] Editio Tertia. Baltimori, 1860.
[4] Glasgow. Margey. 1859.

Ritual for the blessing of the font, omitting the Litany, the infusion of the oils, and, of course, the words to be used in the infusion.

394. We may conclude, then, that in any diocese or district where an abbreviated form of blessing is in use, with the knowledge and approval of the Bishop, it may be used in the case we are now considering, while in other places the form given in the Roman Ritual must be adhered to.

395. The decree of the Synod of Thurles cited in a previous part[1] would seem, at first sight, to prevent in Ireland the use of any other form than that of the Roman Ritual; but probably it may be understood with the limitation expressed in the preceding paragraph, n. 7, which we have given above,[2] and in this sense it would not extend to the cases in which the Synod itself permits the custom of baptizing solemnly in private houses to be continued, and in which it may be necessary to bless water for the occasion. In these cases it would still be left to the Bishop to determine how far it is necessary or expedient to continue the observance of the old custom, as regards the blessing of the water as well as the other ceremonies.

396. Since the Synod of Thurles, however, provincial synods have been held, and in one of these for the province of Dublin, the ceremonies are prohibited outside the church, and a strict adherence to the Roman Ritual as regards baptism is enjoined everywhere throughout the province. "Si aliquando contigerit Parochum aut "ejus vicarium vocari ad baptizandum infantem vita

[1] Supra, n. 238. [2] Supra, n. 387.

"periclitantem in privata domo, is accepta aqua bene-
"dicta de Fonte Baptismali (si tamen commode fieri
"potest) statim accedat, et Baptismum administret absque
"cæremoniis in Rituali Romano præscriptis, quæ tamen,
"si baptizatus postea vixerit, et cum primum convaluerit,
"in Ecclesia suppleri omnino debeant, servatâ in omnibus
"Decreti 23 Septembris 1823 formâ editi a Sacra Con-
"gregatione Rituum".[1]

397. Wherever, then, in Ireland, the old custom has been thus expressly abolished, the priest, when required to baptize outside the church, must adhere to the present rubrics, omitting the ceremonies that precede baptism, and using common water when he cannot get water from the font.[2]

§ XXVIII.—**Deinde, si habeat Chrisma, liniat eum in vertice, dicens:** *Deus Omnipotens, etc.*

Postea dat ei linteolum candidum, dicens: *Accipe vestem, etc.*

Ac demum dat ei cereum candelam accensam, dicens: *Accipe lampadem, etc.*

Si supervixerit, suppleantur alii ritus omissi.

398. It is plain from this rubric that all the ceremonies which follow the application of the matter and form, and which have been treated of above,[3] are to be performed by the priest, if they can be conveniently, even when he baptizes in necessity outside the church. It

[1] *Acta et Decreta Conc. Prov. Dublinen.* Dublini habiti mense Junio, 1853. *Decr.* 10. The Decree of the S. C. R. referred to is, no doubt, the one that has been cited above, n. 382, and will be found in the appendix, so that 1823, must be a misprint for 1820.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 383.

[3] Supra, n. 349 et seq.

may easily happen that he has not with him the holy chrism, nor does the rubric impose any obligation of bringing it with him when he is called on to baptize in such circumstances; but if he has it with him, "**si habeat Chrisma**", he should use it, and not wait till the child, if it survives, be afterwards brought to the church.

399. If he has not the chrism, it may be asked whether he should at least perform the other ceremonies, of presenting the garment and the lighted candle. We have not seen this question discussed, but we believe that in such circumstances it is the usual, and the approved, course, to leave all to be afterwards supplied in the church in the manner directed by the Ritual.[1]

§ XXIX.—**Admonendi sunt Susceptores de spirituali cognatione quam contraxerunt cum baptizato, baptizatique patre et matre; quæ cognatio impedit Matrimonium, ac dirimit.**

400. Baruffaldi observes[2] that it may be useful sometimes to give this admonition to the sponsors, before the ceremony commences, for some might be unwilling to act as sponsors, if they knew the relationship they were about to contract, and the matrimonial impediment resulting from it. But, however they may have been instructed on the subject previously, the priest must not omit, at the conclusion of the ceremony, to give them the admonition here prescribed, telling them that they have contracted a spiritual relationship with the child and its parents, such as to prevent a marriage between the god-

[1] Vid. infra, chap. vii.

[2] Tit. xi. n. 62.

father and the child, or its mother; and between the godmother and the child, or its father. This is the precise extent of the impediment which results, and which renders such marriage null, unless a dispensation has been previously obtained;[1] but no impediment arises between the sponsors themselves.[2]

401. It has been already stated[3] how the relationship affects the minister; but no relationship, and consequently no impediment, is contracted by the sponsors, unless when baptism is administered solemnly, with all the ceremonies.[4] Although sponsors, if admitted in a private baptism, contract no impediment,[5] it must not be supposed that baptism in a private house with all the ceremonies, such as we have before mentioned,[6] is to be regarded as a private baptism.

402. The impediment is not contracted by those who act as sponsors when the ceremonies are merely supplied, according to an express declaration of the sacred Congregation of the Council.[7] It is probably not contracted even when the same persons have been permitted to act as sponsors in the private baptism previously conferred.[8]

403. It is, of course, doubtful, whether or no it be contracted when the baptism is conferred conditionally. In this case, if the doubt be merely negative, the

[1] Carriere, *De Matrimonio*, n. 679. [2] Ibid.
[3] Supra, n. 188.
[4] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 149. Carriere, n. 684.
[5] St. Lig. l. c. Vid. supra, n. 385.
[6] Supra, n. 227. [7] Cit. apud Carriere, n. 682.
[8] Collet apud Carriere, n. 685.

impediment arises, according to the common opinion; but if it be positive, *e.g.*, if it be known that baptism has been privately administered, though there is a doubt about its validity, it is very probable the impediment is not contracted.[1] In such a case as this, and generally when there is a solid probability, according to canonists and theologians, not mere probability of fact, against the existence of an impediment established only by the ecclesiastical law, St. Liguori teaches that it may be assumed practically not to exist, or to be removed by the Church.[2]

§ XXX.—**Curet Parochus parentes infantis admoneri, ne in lecto secum ipsi, vel nutrices parvulum habeant, propter oppressionis periculum; sed eum diligenter custodiant, et opportune ad Christianam disciplinam instituant.**

404. Attention to this admonition is of the greatest importance, for experience proves that many infants are suffocated by being allowed to sleep in the same bed with their parents or nurses. This abuse was noticed as destructive to infant life, and prohibited as such from an early period by the canon law.[3] It was severely censured in several provincial and diocesan synods, and not unfrequently made a reserved case.[4] It was made a reserved case in the synod of the province of Armagh, held in 1670, under Primate Oliver Plunkett.[5] St. Charles, in

[1] St. Lig., n. 151.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 901.
[3] Cfr. Reiffenstuel, lib. v. *Decretal.* Tit. x. n. 11.
[4] Baruff., tit. xi. n. 65. Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § xxxiv. n. iii.
[5] Cap. viii. *De Casibus Ordinario reservatis*, 2°. Vid. *Collections on Irish Church History*, etc., pag. 161.

the fourth Council of Milan, enacted that those who keep in the same bed with themselves infants of less than a year old, without adopting certain precautions to be specified by the pastor, shall incur excommunication *ipso facto*.[1]

405. We have the more reason to admire the wisdom and tenderness of the Church in her efforts to ward off this danger to infants, when we consider certain facts that have been recently brought out by the registration of deaths in England. It appears that, during the seven years, 1848—1854, of 8,277 who are returned as having died from "hanging and suffocation", 2,826, or more than a third, were children under one year;[2] and, although it is not stated, it can hardly be doubted that most of these were suffocated in bed. Dr. Lankester, in an analysis of the verdicts returned by coroners' juries in London, from 1st August, 1862, till the 31st July, 1863, states that, out of 1080 inquests in all, no less than ninety were held on children who met their death, according to the verdict returned, by "suffocation from "lying in bed with the mother". Of these, four were newly born, seven between one and five years, and seventy-nine under one year. "In a very large propor- "tion of these cases", he observes, "the mother falls "asleep with her babe upon her breast, and the child is "thus suffocated in the act of sucking. Sometimes the "child is found dead between the father and mother. In "such a position, even when the clothes are adjusted

[1] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. i. conc. prov. 4. *Quæ pertinent ad Sacramentum Baptismi*, pag. 110.

[2] Eighteenth Annual Report of the Registrar General in England.

" before sleep comes on, the infant is likely to be easily " covered over, by the restlessness of either of its parents".[1]

406. It would be difficult, no doubt, to insist on a strict compliance with what our rubric prescribes, amongst the very poor, who are badly provided with beds, clothing, etc.; but at least their attention should be called to the matter, and they should be earnestly exhorted to take all the precautions they can, in their circumstances, to guard against danger. St. Liguori cites with approval the opinion of Collet and others, that if the infant cannot otherwise be kept sufficiently warm, and if the mother or nurse is certain that she is not in the habit of changing her position during sleep, the practice of keeping the infant in bed with her, may be free from any fault.[2]

§ XXXI.—**Commonendi sunt etiam parentes, et alii, si opus fuerit, ne filios Hebræis, allisve infidelibus, vel hæreticis mulieribus ullo modo lactandos, aut nutriendos tradant.**

407. The mother is evidently bound by the law of nature to suckle her infant, and there must be a just cause to exempt her from complying with this obligation. The milk of the mother, and not that of a strange woman, is provided by nature as the nutriment best suited to the child. To withhold this nutriment, then, unless for very good reasons, is to act against the dictates of nature and to do an injury to the child, which, according to all theologians, is at least a venial sin.[3] Amongst the excusing

[1] *Social Science Review*, June, 1864, pag. 516. [2] Lib. vi. n. 160.
[3] Vid. A Lapide, *Commentarium* in Gen. xxi. 7.

causes, St. Liguori mentions delicacy of health and the custom which may exist amongst persons of the same rank.[1]

408. In all cases, however, in which an infant is confided to a nurse, care must be taken that a proper person be selected. The neglect of parents in this particular may easily amount to grievous sin.[2] It is not enough that she be sound and healthy; she should also be of good moral dispositions; and to make sure of this, as well as to guard against any danger to the faith or morals of the child, should it be in any way under her charge after the period of infancy, care ought to be taken that she be a good practical Catholic.

409. The qualities of the nurse have proverbially a great influence, not only on the health, but on the temper and dispositions of the child. It is not without reason that persons are often said to have imbibed such or such a disposition with their mother's milk. If it be true that certain dispositions are often transmitted from the parent to the child, we cannot be surprised if the dispositions of the nurse too are sometimes conveyed with the nourishment which she supplies to it. Whatever may be said of the question physiologically, there can be no doubt about the fact;[3] and it is the duty of the pastor to instruct parents in their obligations on this head, as is here directed by the ritual. It may be useful to remind them of these obligations immediately after the baptism of the child, but, as was before observed,[4]

[1] Lib. iv. n. 836, 2 in parenth.

[2] Busembaum, apud St. Lig., l. c.

[3] Cfr. Catal., tit. ii. cap. ii. § XXXV. n. ii.

[4] Supra, n. 231.

he may do so at other times, and perhaps he might do so with greater fruit, and with less danger of offending individuals, by speaking of the matter in a general instruction.

§ XXXII.—**Antequam infans ex Ecclesia asportetur, aut susceptores discedant, eorum nomina, et alia de administrato Baptismo ad præscriptam formam in Baptismali libro Parochus accurate describat.**

410. It is not without reason that the priest is here admonished to make the usual entry in the baptismal register before the parties withdraw from the church. If he does not do so, he may easily forget the names, or even neglect the matter altogether. Hence the "liber baptismalis" is reckoned amongst the things that should be in readiness when baptism is about to be administered.[1] The Synod of Thurles directs that the register be kept in the manner prescribed by the ritual.[2] It is unnecessary to dwell on the importance of accuracy in this matter, since the weightiest interests, such as the proof of marriages, the transmission of property, etc., may often depend on it.

§ XXXIII.—ADDITAMENTUM.

411. Before concluding this chapter, it may not be uninteresting to note that, according to the ancient discipline of the Church, Confirmation and Holy Communion were administered immediately after Baptism even to infants.[3]

[1] Chap. iii., § lii.
[2] *De Parochis*, n. 27.
[3] Martene, lib. i. cap. i., art. xv., n. xi., Bened. XIV., *De Synod. Dioc.* lib. vii. cap. x. n. 8 et cap. xii. n. 1.

When the bishop himself baptized, he confirmed the neophyte immediately after baptism, anointing him on the forehead with chrism. It was to supply for this, in some way, when the bishop was absent, and when, therefore, the sacrament of Confirmation had to be deferred, that priests were permitted to anoint the crown with chrism; and it was thus the vertical unction was introduced and prescribed amongst the ceremonies of solemn baptism.[1]

412. When baptism came to be generally administered by priests,[2] the newly baptized, infants as well as adults, were presented to the bishop to be confirmed, when he visited the several districts of his diocese.[3] A good illustration of this is given in the life of St. Cuthbert, cited by Lingard.[4] Martene cites the decrees of several ancient synods which order parents under severe penalties to present their children for confirmation when they have the opportunity. Amongst others, he cites one of a synod held at Oxford in 1287, which provided "that, if through "the negligence of a parent, a child be not confirmed "before it is three years of age, the parent be obliged to "fast on bread and water every Friday until the child "shall have received confirmation".[5]

413. This usage of administering confirmation even to infants as soon as convenient after baptism, was generally observed throughout the Latin Church until the thirteenth century. After this time a different custom

[1] Vid. supra, n. 248. [2] Vid. supra, n. 184.

[3] Martene, lib. i. cap. ii. art. i. n. iv.

[4] *History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, chap. vii. page 322.

[5] Loc. cit., n. vi.

began to prevail, and it was judged more expedient not to confirm children until they had attained the use of reason.[1] "It is to be observed", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that after Baptism, the sacrament of Con-"firmation may indeed be administered to all, but that "until children shall have reached the use of reason, its "administration were inexpedient. If not, therefore, to "be postponed to the age of twelve, it is most proper to "defer this sacrament to at least that of seven".[2] This, then, is the general rule at present.

414. But there are two cases in which the bishop may still lawfully, and even laudably, confirm children, before they have attained the use of reason. 1° When an infant is in danger of death. 2° When there is reason to fear that there will not be an opportunity of having the sacrament conferred for a very long time afterwards.[3] These exceptional cases show, according to Benedict XIV.,[4] that there is no opposition between the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which gives the general rule in the above extract, and the Roman Pontifical, which clearly supposes that infants may be confirmed, and directs what is to be done when they are presented for confirmation.[5]

415. In the Greek Church there is still a rigid adherence to the ancient discipline. The priest, immediately after conferring Baptism, instead of applying the vertical unction, as is done in the Latin Church, confers

[1] Benedict XIV. *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. x. n. 3.
[2] Pars. ii. cap. iii. n. 18.
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 178. Benedict XIV., l. c. n. 5, et seq.
[4] Loc. cit., n 8.
[5] *De Confirmandis*, Rubricæ, § 1.

the sacrament of Confirmation. He is directed by the "Euchologium" to make the sign of the cross with chrism on the forehead, and also on the eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears—the breast also, and the hands and feet, according to some ordines, as in the ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΜΕΓΑ[1]—pronouncing the words Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, "Signaculum doni Spiritus Sancti", which are the form of the sacrament.[2]

416. It is true that a bishop is the ordinary minister of Confirmation, and that a simple priest has not the same power of conferring it that a bishop has;[3] but it cannot be doubted that a simple priest can administer it, when he is delegated by the Roman Pontiff,[4] and Benedict XIV. clearly conveys that the priests in the Greek Church are so delegated, at least tacitly, unless where there is evidence to the contrary, as is the case with respect to some districts.[5]

417. With regard to Holy Communion, it is quite certain that, according to the ancient discipline, it was administered to infants after baptism.[6] It was administered to them "sub specie vini". At first it was usual to put the chalice to the infant's mouth, as may be inferred from a passage of St. Cyprian in his book *De Lapsis*.[7] But afterwards a different practice was intro-

[1] Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος. Cfr. Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ord. xxii. et seq. et cap ii. art. iii. n. x.

[2] Vid. Perrone, *De Confirmatione*, cap. iii.

[3] Concil. Trid., Sess. xxiii. can. vii.

[4] Benedict XIV., lib. vii. cap. vii., n. 4. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 170.

[5] Cap. ix. n. 2 et seq.

[6] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. xi. et seq. Benedict XIV. lib. vii. cap. xii. n. i.

[7] Cit. apud Martene, l. c. n. xv.

duced. The priest dipped his finger into the chalice, and put it thus moistened with the sacred blood into the mouth of the infant, who would naturally suck it. In some churches the priest used, instead of his finger, a spoon which he moistened and presented in the same way.[1]

418. It would appear from Martene, that this use of the spoon was generally adopted, for it is still continued by the Greeks and other Oriental Churches that adhere to the ancient usage of administering communion to infants.[2] Goar, describing the present practice of the Greeks, says, "Cochleari, quod Λάβιδα dicunt, sacro sanguine intincto, "guttulam e calice eductam pueri lingua exsugendam "apponunt; et si quidem extra liturgiam aliquem initiant "ægrotis sacramenta reservata depromunt; sin liturgia "celebretur, ex ipsis speciebus consecratis".[3]

419. In the Latin Church the practice of giving communion to infants after Baptism was common until the tenth century, and had not altogether ceased even in the twelfth, as is clearly shown by Martene,[4] and Benedict XIV.,[5] who, however, observes that it had completely disappeared in the thirteenth. In reference to the ancient usage, as well as to the existing discipline, the Council of Trent has the following: "Denique eadem sancta "Synodus docet parvulos usu rationis carentes, nulla "obligari necessitate ad sacramentalem Eucharistiæ com-"munionem; siquidem per Baptismi lavacrum regenerati "et Christo incorporati, adeptam jam filiorum Dei gra-

[1] Martene, loc. cit.

[2] Loc. cit., Vid. etiam, lib. i., cap. iv., art. x., n. xiv.

[3] ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ, etc., *De Pueri post Baptismum ablutione*, not. 5, pag. 374. [4] Loc. cit. [5] Loc. cit.

"tiam in illa ætate amittere non possunt. Neque ideo "tamen damnanda est antiquitas, si eum morem in qui- "busdam locis aliquando servavit: ut enim sanctissimi "illi patres sui facti probabilem causam pro illius temporis "ratione habuerunt: ita certe, eos nulla salutis necessi- "tate id fecisse, sine controversia credendum est".[1]

420. Besides Confirmation and Communion, it was usual, according to the ancient observance, at least in the Western Church, to administer also milk and honey to the newly baptized, as Martene shows from the testimony of Tertullian, St. Jerome, and others.[2] Catalani[3] observes that this ceremony, as appears from a formula for blessing the milk and honey given in an ancient Roman Ordo which he cites, was designed to signify, mystically, that the neophyte, having left the Egypt of darkness and sin, had entered the Church—a land abounding in spiritual blessings.

[1] Sess. xxi. cap. iv. *De Communione.*
[2] Lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. xvi.
[3] Tit. ii. cap. ii. § xxv. Appendix, n. x.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE BAPTISM OF ADULTS.

DE BAPTISMO ADULTORUM.

§ I.—Si quis adultus sit baptizandus, debet prius, secundum Apostolicam regulam, in Christiana Fide, ac sanctis moribus diligenter instrui, et per aliquot dies in operibus pietatis exerceri, ejusque voluntas et propositum sæpius explorari, et nonnisi sciens et volens, probeque instructus baptizari.

421. We have seen that the Church requires infants to be presented for Baptism with as little delay as possible;[1] but when an adult is to be baptized, she requires him to be previously well instructed and prepared, so that there may be no doubt as to his intention and disposition in receiving the Sacrament. Hence, according to the ancient discipline, all adult candidates for baptism were obliged to receive a certain course of instructions in the Christian doctrine, from which they were called "Catechumens", i.e., persons under instruction. They were distinguished into several classes, or grades, according to their progress, but there is some diversity of opinion as to the number of these grades, and the names by which

[1] Supra, n. 192.

they were known. According to Catalani[1] and Fornici[2] there were three;—1° the "Audientes", who merely heard the public instructions in the Church, and were obliged to leave with the pagans and public penitents, not being yet enrolled amongst the Catechumens, properly so called. 2° the Catechumens themselves, also called "Genuflectentes", who knelt in the church, and over whom certain prayers were pronounced. 3° the "Electi" or "Competentes", who were judged fit to receive baptism at the Easter or Pentecost next following.

422. The duration of the catechumenate varied in different churches, and it does not appear that it was at any time fixed by a uniform discipline: it was left to the prudence and discretion of the bishop to determine it according to circumstances.[3] There was some diversity of practice also as regards the ceremonies observed in the admission of catechumens and in the subsequent stages of their probation; but it is evident from Martene,[4] that, generally speaking, they included all those ceremonies that are still used by the Church in the solemn administration of baptism, though they were then applied at intervals during the preparation, and not, as at present, all together when the sacrament is conferred. The ceremonies were comprised under the general name of "Scrutinia", so called because they implied a careful scrutiny as to the dispositions of the catechumens.[5]

423. This ancient discipline regarding the catechumens naturally fell into disuse as the spread and establish-

[1] Tit. i., cap. ii. § i. n. vi.
[2] Para. iii. cap. viii.
[3] Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. viii. n. i., ii., iii.
[4] Art. vi. per totum.
[5] Ibid, art. xi.

ment of Christianity diminished the number of adult baptisms, and it ceased, at least as to its form, in the ninth or, at latest, the eleventh century.[1] So far, however, as it required the instruction of the person to be baptized in the Christian doctrine and in the dispositions necessary for the worthy reception of the sacrament, it is still retained, and never was, nor ever could be, dispensed with. In the case of adults, instruction must always precede the administration of the sacrament, and this, as our rubric says, "**secundum Apostolicam regulam**", for so the Apostles did—they first preached and instructed, and then baptized. This rule is justly inferred from the words of Christ himself, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them", etc., as is observed by the Catechism of the Council of Trent in the passage already cited.[2]

424. By the word *adult* we are here to understand any one who has attained the perfect use of reason—"qui adulta ætate sunt, et perfectum rationis usum "habent".[3] This is presumed with regard to all who have completed their seventh year.[4]

425. The duty of instructing the catechumens was often performed by the bishop, but more frequently by priests, deacons, or persons in minor orders, and sometimes even by laics.[5] At present the missionaries in infidel countries are very glad to avail themselves of the services of any one who is himself sufficiently instructed

[1] Martene, art. xi. n. iv.
[2] Supra, n. 295.
[3] Catech. Conc. Trid. pars ii. cap. ii., *De Baptismo*, n. 35.
[4] Baruff. tit. xii. n. 8 et seq.
[5] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. v. n. ii.

to undertake the office of catechist,[1] and it is a matter of no great moment by whom the duty is performed, if it be efficiently performed.

426. Great care must be taken, according to the rubric, not only to instruct the candidate in the Christian doctrine and precepts, but also to ascertain, as far as possible, his dispositions, his wishes, and intentions in presenting himself for baptism. "The faithful", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "are also to be in-"structed in the dispositions for Baptism, and are to be "taught that, in the first place, they must desire and pur-"pose to receive it; for as in baptism we die to sin and "engage to enter upon a new manner and discipline of "life, it is fit that it be administered to those only who "receive it of their own free will and accord, and is to "be forced upon none. Hence we learn from holy tra-"dition that it has been the invariable practice of the "Church to administer baptism to no one without pre-"viously asking him if he will receive it. This will "even infants are presumed not to be without, for the "will of the Church, who answers for them, cannot be "doubtful".[2]

427. An intention of receiving Baptism is necessary in adults even for its validity.[3] In treating of that which is required in the minister of a sacrament, we mentioned the several kinds of intention distinguished by theologians,[4] and we may here observe that in the recipient what is called the *habitual* intention suffices for the

[1] "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith", passim.
[2] Para. ii. cap. ii. n. 38.
[3] St. Lig. lib. vi. n. 81 et n. 139. [4] Supra, n. 137.

validity of baptism.[1] It might seem that the intention of receiving baptism, if it exists at all, could not be other than explicit, but yet it might be implicit. A desire of embracing the Christian religion in one who has yet heard nothing of baptism, would, according to De Lugo,[2] be sufficient for the validity.

428. To receive baptism, however, not only validly but licitly and with fruit—in other words, to receive not only the character which it impresses on the soul, but the sanctifying and regenerating grace which it produces, certain dispositions are required besides the intention. What these are we are taught in the following words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Besides a will "to be baptized, in order to obtain the grace of the sacra- "ment, faith also is, in like manner, most necessary; for "our Lord and Saviour has taught: 'He that believeth "'and is baptized, shall be saved'. *Mark*, xvi. 16. "Another necessary condition is compunction for past "transgressions, and a fixed determination to refrain "from all sins for the future".[3]

429. The more perfect these dispositions are, the greater the grace that will be received in the sacrament,[4] and hence it is important that the candidates for baptism should be, as the rubric here directs, employed in pious exercises for some days previous to receiving it. According to the instructions drawn up for the use of the Missionaries of the Propaganda, the time for the instruc-

[1] St. Lig., l. c.
De Sacramentis, Disp. ix. n. 130, *Valeret tamen.*
[3] Loc. cit. n. 40.
[4] Vid. De Lugo. *De Sacramentis*, Disp. ix., sect. ii. n. 12.

tion and preparation of catechumens should not, as a general rule, be less than forty days.[1]

§ II.—**At vero si quis, dum instruitur, in mortis periculum incidat, baptismique voluerit, habita ratione periculi, vel necessitatis, baptizetur.**

430. This rubric provides for the case in which a catechumen is in danger of death before his instruction has been fully completed; and we are here led to inquire what articles he must know and believe, in order that baptism may be administered to him.

I. It is certain that he must believe "that God exists "and is a rewarder to them that seek Him".[2] An explicit belief in this is necessary to the justification of an adult, *necessitate medii*, and without it baptism could not be administered to him in any circumstances.

431. II. He must believe in the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. An explicit belief in these articles is held by many theologians to be, since the promulgation of the Gospel, equally necessary with the preceding. This opinion seems the more probable to St. Liguori, but he admits, as probable enough,[3] the opinion of others who maintain that the explicit belief of these articles is not necessary, *necessitate medii*, but only *necessitate præcepti*. Cardinal De Lugo discusses the question at great length,[4] and although he maintains this second

[1] *Monita ad Missionarios* S. Congreg. De Propaganda Fide, cap. vii., art. i.

[2] Heb., xi. 6.

[3] Lib. iii. n. 2.

[4] *De Fide*, Disp., xii. sec. iv.

opinion as more probable,[1] he concludes by saying, that the explicit belief of these mysteries is necessary, *necessitate medii*, for the first justification of an adult, not indeed *in re* but *in voto*, which he explains thus. To receive the grace of justification, it is required, *necessitate medii*, to have the desire (*votum*) of fulfilling all the precepts, and amongst the rest, of course, that of explicitly believing these mysteries. Now, in the law of grace, this belief is required, not simply as the fulfilment of another precept might be required, but as a positive disposition at least for first justification; and therefore, may be said, when it is not had *in re*, to be necessary *in voto*, just in the same way as baptism is necessary *in voto*, when it is not actually received. "Unde", he says, "ultimo addere possumus, cum Suarez, fidem explicitam "Trinitatis et Incarnationis esse in lege gratiæ medium "necessarium omnibus ad salutem, nam per se loquendo, "debet hæc fides præcedere susceptionem baptismi; si "autem aliquando non præcedit, hoc est propter igno- "rantiam, vel impotentiam, et per accidens";[2] and again, "Cum fides illa per se præcedere debeat baptismum nisi "per accidens ignorantia vel inadvertentia, aut impoten- "tia excuset, consequens est ut sicut baptismus est neces- "sarius, sic et fides illa quæ baptismum præcedere debet, "et sicut votum baptismi supplet pro baptismo, ita et "votum illius fidei, quod includitur in voto baptismi "supplet pro eadem fide explicita".[3]

432. At all events it is certain that baptism cannot be conferred on any one who does not explicitly believe the

[1] Loc. cit. n. 91 et seq.
[2] Loc. cit. n. 106.
[3] Ibid., n. 107.

Trinity and Incarnation, unless in a case of extreme necessity. The Congregation of the Holy Office, being asked whether a missionary is bound before administering baptism to instruct in these mysteries an adult in danger of death, or whether it might not suffice to exact a promise that he would be instructed in them in case of recovery, decided: "Non sufficere promissionem, sed "missionarium teneri adulto etiam moribundo, qui inca- "pax omnino non sit, explicare fidei mysteria, quæ sunt "necessaria necessitate medii, ut sunt præcipua mysteria "Trinitatis et Incarnationis".[1] If he be at all capable of instruction, therefore, he must be taught these mysteries before he is baptized. But if we suppose the case of a convert from paganism, who explicitly believes in the existence of God and the rewards and punishments of the next life, and desires to embrace the Christian religion, but is suddenly seized with a fatal illness that renders him incapable of being instructed, we think that baptism might and ought to be administered to him.

433. III. He is required to know, at least in substance and according to his capacity, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the precepts of the Decalogue, and the Christian doctrine regarding the sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist. Every Christian adult is bound to this under pain of grievous sin,[2] and no one should be baptized, unless in case of necessity, until he has learned them.[3]

[1] 10 Mali. 1703, cit. apud "Analecta Juris Pontificii", II^me^ Serie, pag. 1805.

[2] St. Lig., lib. iii., n. 3. De Lugo, *De Fide*, Disp. xiii., n. 63, et n. 116, et seq.

[3] St. Lig. lib. vi., n. 139.

434. So much for what is of strict obligation. But we need scarcely add that every candidate for baptism should, as far as circumstances permit, be fully instructed in the Christian doctrine, as given in some approved catechism, and not only learn in substance, but carefully commit to memory, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Angelical Salutation, as all the faithful are bound to do, at least *sub veniali*.[1]

These are the principles by which it may be decided how far, in any proposed case, the previous instruction may be dispensed with. There can be no doubt that, according to the ancient discipline of the Church, it was dispensed with in danger of death, not only in the case of catechumens, but even with regard to those who were not yet enrolled amongst the catechumens, provided they manifested, either by themselves or through others, a desire of receiving baptism.[2]

§ III.—**Adultorum Baptismus, ubi commode fieri potest, ad Episcopum deferatur, ut si illi placuerit, ab eo solemnius conferatur; alioquin Parochus ipse baptizet, stata cæremonia.**

435. This rubric is a relic of the ancient discipline, according to which the solemn administration of baptism was usually confined to the bishop.[3] The Church desires to invest the baptism of adults with as much solemnity as possible, and hence the rubric directs that, if it be at all convenient, it should be reserved for the bishop him-

[1] St. Lig., lib. iii, n. 3. De Lugo, l. c. n. 133.
[2] Catal., tit. ii., cap. iii., § ii., n. iv.
[3] Supra, n. 184.

self; if not, that it be administered by the pastor with all the ceremonies hereafter prescribed.

§ IV.—Decet autem hujusmodi Baptismum, ex Apostolico instituto, in Sabbato Sancto Paschatis, vel Pentecostes solemniter celebrari.

Quare si circa hæc tempora Catechumeni sint baptizandi, in ipsos dies, si nihil impediat, baptismum differri convenit.

436. We have anticipated, in a preceding chapter, the explanation of this rubric.[1] Here we shall merely add, that the delay of baptism which it may not unfrequently require is not always a sufficient reason for departing from it, since, in the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, cited by the "Monita ad Missionarios",[2] "The delay is not attended with the danger already "noticed in the case of infants, for, should any unforeseen "accident render it impossible for adults to be baptized, "their intention of receiving it, and their repentance for "past sins, will avail them to grace and righteousness. "On the other hand, this delay seems to be attended "with some advantages; for, in the first place, as the "Church must take particular care that none approach "this sacrament with dissimulation and hypocrisy, the "intentions of such as solicit baptism are better explored "and ascertained; and hence it is that we find it decreed "in ancient councils, that Jewish converts before ad- "mission to baptism should be some months in the ranks "of the catechumens. The candidate for baptism is "also thus better instructed in the faith which he is to

[1] Vid supra, chap. iii., § xxix.

[2] Cap. vii. art. i.

"profess, and in the practices of a Christian life; and "the sacrament, when administered to adults with solemn "ceremonies on the appointed days of Easter and Pente- "cost only, is treated with more religious respect".[1]

§ V.—**Verum si circa, seu post tempus Pentecostes aliqui conversi fuerint, qui ægre ferant suum Baptismum in longum tempus differri, et ad illud festinent, instructique ac rite parati esse noscantur, citius baptizari possunt.**

437. It would be a long time to wait from Pentecost, or soon after Pentecost, till Easter of the next year, and hence if there be any converted about this time, who would be unwilling to wait so long, the rubric permits them to be baptized sooner, provided they be properly instructed and prepared. "Sometimes", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "when there exists a just "and necessary cause to exclude delay, its administration "is not to be deferred, as for instance when danger "of death seems imminent, and particularly when the "person to be baptized is already fully instructed in the "mysteries of faith. This we find to have been done by "Philip, and by the Prince of the Apostles, when the "one baptized the eunuch of Queen Candace, the other "Cornelius, without the intervention of any delay, as "soon as they professed to embrace the faith (*Acts*, viii. "38, x. 48").[2]

§ VI.—**Catechumenus instructus baptizetur in Ecclesia, seu Baptisterio. Patrinus ei assistat, et ipse Catechumenus**

[1] Par. ii. cap. ii. n. 36.

[2] Loc. cit. n. 37.

ad Sacerdotis interrogationes respondeat, nisi mutus fuerit, aut omnino surdus, vel ignotæ linguæ: quo casu vel per Patrinum, si illam intelligat, aut alium interpretem, vel nutu consensum explicet suum.

438. The rubric here repeats, with respect to adults, what is prescribed regarding the place for the solemn administration of baptism generally.[1] But the exception which is made in favour of the children of princes,[2] is not understood to extend to adults.[3] All that has before been said regarding the sponsors, their qualifications, duties, etc.,[4] applies to those who assist at the baptism of adults. The adult himself, however, and not the sponsor, must reply to the interrogations of the priest, as the rubric directs, unless he is a deaf-mute or speaks a language which the priest cannot understand.

439. A deaf-mute, if trained according to the method now adopted with so much success, can be easily instructed, and may answer to the interrogations in writing or by signs; but still we think the sponsor should answer for him as for an infant, and it would be obviously a great convenience if the sponsor selected were one who could interpret the signs and express them in words for the priest. If he has not been trained, since he cannot have received the necessary instruction, the baptism must be deferred until he shall have been, in some way, trained and instructed. If there be no time for delay, or if it be found impossible to instruct him, some say he should not

[1] Vid. supra, n. 238 et seq.
[2] Supra, n. 241.
[3] Baruff., tit. xii. n. 44. Fornici, pars. iii. cap. viii.
[4] Supra, n. 218 et seq.

be baptized;[1] but others, whose opinion should be followed in practice, teach that one in such circumstances may be baptized. Either he is to be treated as one whose condition does not practically differ from that of children, or, at all events, he is not to be deprived of the chance which conditional baptism would give him.[2]

440. If he speaks a language which the priest cannot understand, the rubric directs that he should answer through an interpreter, if possible through the sponsor acting at the same time as interpreter. It must seldom happen that an interpreter cannot be found, if there be time to seek one; but, in case of necessity, baptism may be administered to any one who, even by signs, manifests a desire of receiving it.

§ VII.—**Pro hujus autem veneratione Sacramenti, tam Sacerdotem qui adultos baptizabit, quam ipsos adultos qui sani sunt, convenit esse jejunos.**

Quare non post epulas, aut prandia, sed ante meridiem, nisi ex rationabili causa aliter faciendum esset, eorum Baptisma celebretur.

441. According to the ancient usage, baptism was conferred, as we have seen,[3] only on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, which were fast days; moreover the neophytes were confirmed and received the Holy Eucharist immediately after baptism.[4] But it was not merely for these reasons that they, as well as the minister, were required

[1] Cfr. Ferraris, *V. Baptismus*, art. v. n. 132.

[2] Vid. Lacroix, lib. vi. par. i. n. 291. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 92.

[3] Supra, n. 235.

[4] Baruff., tit. xii. n. 53. Vid. infra, chap. vi. § xlvi.

to be fasting. This was prescribed also out of respect for the holy sacrament of baptism itself, as is plain from the fact that, when it became usual to administer it at other times, and without its being immediately followed by Communion, fasting was still enjoined by several canons [1] The present rubric recommends it, but is not understood to convey a strict precept. Of course if the minister is to celebrate mass, and the neophytes to receive communion, according to what is said hereafter in the rubric,[2] all must be fasting. But in other circumstances what is here prescribed regarding the fast, or the hour of the day, is rarely attended to, according to Baruffaldi[3] and Catalani.[4]

§ VIII.—**Admonendus est Catechumenus, ut peccatorum suorum pœniteat.**

442. "The remission of all sin, original and actual", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "is the proper "effect of baptism; and that such was the object of its "institution by our Lord and Saviour, is, to omit other "testimonies, conveyed in the clearest terms by the Prince "of the Apostles, when he says: 'Do penance and be "'baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, "'for the remission of sins'—*Acts*, ii. 38".[5]

443. For the remission of original sin no act of sorrow is necessary; and hence, if we suppose a catechumen never

[1] Vid. Chardon, *Histoire des Sacrements*, liv. I^re^ sect. I^re^ part. 2^de^ chap. ix. Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. iv. n. iv.

[2] Infra, chap. vi. § xlvi.

[3] Tit. xii. n. 55.

[4] Tit. ii. cap. iii. § ix. n. iii.

[5] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 44.

to have fallen into any actual sin, it is enough for him, in order to receive baptism with fruit, to have, besides faith and hope, the purpose of observing the precepts.[1] This, however, is a very rare case,[2] and it is certain that, if he has been guilty of grievous actual sin, he must have sorrow for it in order to obtain its remission.[3] The Council of Trent teaches that this sorrow has been at all times necessary for justification to all who have defiled themselves by mortal sin, even to those who seek to be cleansed by the sacrament of baptism: "Fuit quidem poenitentia "universis hominibus qui se mortali aliquo peccato in- "quinassent, quovis tempore ad gratiam et justitiam "assequendam necessaria, illis etiam qui baptismi sacra- "mento ablui petivissent, ut perversitate abjecta et emen- "data, tantam Dei offensionem cum peccati odio et pio "animi dolore detestarentur".[4] The catechumen then should be admonished, as the rubric here directs, to repent of his sins.

444. Unless we suppose the rare case in which baptism is administered immediately after he comes to the use of reason, it is certain that he is not free from all actual sin; and if, as is commonly the case, he has been guilty of grievous sin, the sacrament, though valid, will be without fruit, unless he has at least attrition.[5] If he has committed only venial sins, it is true the want of sorrow will not be an obstacle to the grace of the sacrament and the remission of original sin; yet, since no actual sin, however venial, is remitted without sorrow for it, as

[1] Suarez, *De Baptismo*, Disp. xxviii. sect. i. n. 5.
[2] Suarez, ibid.
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 86.
[4] Sess. xiv. cap. i.
[5] St. Lig., l. c. et n. 139.

theologians commonly teach with St. Augustine, these venial sins will not be remitted, but will remain until he repents of and retracts them.[1]

445. According to the ancient discipline, catechumens prepared themselves for baptism by a course of penitential exercises.[2] They frequently even made a confession of their sins;[3] but of course this cannot be understood of sacramental confession, since no sacrament could be received before baptism; it was an act of humiliation performed in a penitential spirit, and though not necessary as a preparation for baptism, was most useful with the view of getting advice and direction as to their future lives.

446. St. Thomas for this reason recommends that the confession of those who desire it before baptism, should be heard. Having stated that, before baptism, there is no obligation of making a particular confession of sins, such as is required to obtain absolution in penance, but that it suffices to make a confession in a general way, as is made by the catechumen when he renounces Satan and his pomps, he concludes by adding: "Si qui tamen bap-"tizandi, ex devotione, sua peccata confiteri vellent, esset "eorum confessio audienda, non ad hoc quod eis satisfactio "imponeretur, sed ad hoc quod contra peccata consueta "eis spiritualis informatio vitæ traderetur".[4]

447. "In baptism not only are sins forgiven, but "all the punishments due to sins and enormities are also

[1] De Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, Disp. ix. n. 86, et *De Poenitentia*, Disp. ix. n. 13.

[2] Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. x. n. ix. et seq. [3] Ibid., n. xii.

[4] Pars. 3. Quæst. lxviii. art vi.

"benignantly remitted by God".[1] Hence the exercises of penance which precede baptism are never undertaken or imposed as works of satisfaction, but in order to correct evil habits and to prepare the catechumens to receive more abundant grace in the sacrament.[2] The only act of the virtue of penance that is strictly required, is sorrow for the actual sins of which they may have been guilty, with the purpose of avoiding sin for the future. Some theologians would require them to have perfect contrition, but there can be no doubt that attrition is sufficient.[3]

448. If any one, conscious of actual mortal sin, is baptized without this sorrow, he does not receive the grace of the sacrament. He receives the character which it impresses on the soul, and becomes subject to the laws of the Church;[4] but his sins remain and will remain until he has the dispositions required in order that the sacrament may produce its effect. As soon as these dispositions are present, the sacrament revives and produces those effects of grace, which it would have produced the instant it was conferred, had the dispositions been then present.[5]

449. If he has committed no grievous sin since his baptism, the same disposition which would have sufficed for its effect at the time of receiving it, will suffice still, that is to say attrition;[6] but if he has committed any

[1] Cat. Conc. Trid., l. c. n. 45.
[2] Vid. Billuart, *De Baptismo*, Diss. iii. art. v. *Potes* 4°.
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 139.
[4] Cfr. Collet, *De Bapt.*, cap. vii. art. ii. concl. 2 et 3.
[5] De Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, disp. ix. sect. iii. n. 22.
[6] De Lugo, sect. iv. n. 52.

grievous sin since his baptism, either by knowingly receiving it without the requisite dispositions (which would be a sin continued and consummated after the moment of receiving the sacrament), or by any other mortal transgression, it is necessary for him to have either perfect contrition or attrition with the sacrament of penance.

Baptism remits only original sin with the actual sins committed before receiving it; and, as these cannot be remitted without the remission, at the same instant, of the grievous sins committed since receiving it, it follows that, in the present case, baptism cannot revive to produce its effect in remitting the former, unless there be concurrent with it, the means of remitting the latter; and the only means for the remission of sin after baptism is, according to all, either perfect contrition or attrition with the sacrament of penance.[1]

450. It is not to be supposed that the sin committed after baptism must be remitted *before* baptism produces its effect; for in this supposition original sin would be remitted by the infusion of sanctifying grace *before* baptism could operate. We must here distinguish the presence of a cause from its operation. We can conceive the presence of contrition, or of attrition with the sacrament of penance for an instant, *prioritate signi*, before the effect. Now this presence is enough for the reviviscence of baptism, for we have then not only the disposition which would have sufficed for its effect at the time it was conferred, (or subsequently, if no grievous sin

[1] De Lugo, sec. iv. n. 55 et seq.

had been committed after it); but we have also present and ready to coöperate with it, the means of remitting the sins committed since, and which it could not of itself remove. Both causes then operate simultaneously—baptism, in the remission of original sin and the actual sins committed before it; and penance, or perfect contrition, in the remission of those committed after it. All this is beautifully explained by De Lugo.[1] In like manner, if a person has received baptism without sufficient sorrow to obtain the remission of his venial sins, they will be afterwards remitted, both as to guilt and punishment, as soon as he has this sorrow.[2]

§ IX.—**Amentes et furiosi non baptizentur, nisi tales a nativitate fuerint: tunc enim de iis idem judicium faciendum est, quod de infantibus, atque in Fide Ecclesiæ baptizari possunt.**

Sed si dilucida habeant intervalla, dum mentis compotes sunt, baptizentur, si velint. Si vero, antequam insanirent, suscipiendi baptismi desiderium ostenderint, ac vitæ periculum immineat, etiamsi non sint compotes mentis, baptizentur.

451. We have already seen that the intention of receiving baptism is necessary in adults even for its validity, while other dispositions are required to receive it with fruit[3] Now, in the present matter, all who have had at any time the use of reason, are reckoned as adults, and it is on this principle the rubric here proceeds in its directions regarding the insane, which are the same in

[1] Sect. iii. n. 41 et seq.
[2] Ibid., n. 86.
[3] Supra, 427 et seq.

substance as those given by the Catechism of the Council of Trent.[1] If they have been insane from the time of their birth, in other words if they have never had the use of reason, they are to be treated as infants, and baptized in the faith of the Church. If they have had at any time the use of reason, then either the insanity under which they labour is permanent, or it is broken by lucid intervals. If it be permanent, baptism is to be administered, provided that, while they had the use of reason, they manifested any desire of receiving it, and in case of doubt it should be administered conditionally; but if there be no ground for supposing that they had any such desire, they are not to be baptized. The same rule is to be followed if there be danger of death before any existing fit of insanity ceases. If it be not permanent, however—if there be any hope that reason will return, we should wait for the lucid interval, and then, of course, baptize them like other adults if they desire it.[2]

§ X.—**Idemque dicendum est de eo qui lethargo aut phrenesi laborat, ut tantum vigilans et intelligens baptizetur, nisi periculum mortis impendeat, si in eo prius apparuerit Baptismi desiderium.**

452. What has just been said regarding the insane is equally applicable to those who are in a state of lethargy, and therefore, for the time being, without the use of their senses. They are not to be baptized until they recover from that state, except when there is danger of death; and not even then, unless there be some ground for

[1] Par. ii. cap. ii. n. 39.
[2] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 139, et n. 81 in fine.

supposing that they had previously a desire of receiving baptism.

§ XI.—**Sacerdos diligenter curet ut certior fiat de statu et conditione eorum qui baptizari petunt, præsertim extererum: de quibus facta diligenti inquisitione, num alias ac rite sint baptizati, caveat, ne quis jam baptizatus, imperitia, vel errore, aut ad quæstum, vel ob aliam causam, fraude dolove iterum baptizari velit.**

453. We have already dwelt on the obligation of the priest to make careful inquiry, even in the case of infants, as to whether they were previously baptized;[1] and the same obligation exists, *a fortiori*, in the case of adults, especially in countries where there might be any reason to suspect that some would ask for baptism through worldly motives, as has not unfrequently happened, according to Baruffaldi[2] and Catalani.[3] Instances of the kind can hardly occur, unless where there are Jews or Pagans, who might hope to gain some temporal advantage by a pretended conversion to the faith.

§ XII.—**Omnes autem de quibus, re diligenter investigata, probabilis dubitatio est an baptizati fuerint, si nihil impediat, sub conditione baptizentur.**

454. When after due inquiry there remains any doubt, as to whether a person has been baptized, the rubric directs that he be baptized conditionally, if there be nothing to prevent it, that is, if he be properly in-

[1] Supra, n. 174.
[2] Tit. xii. n. 70.
[3] Tit. ii. cap. iii. § xiv. n. iii.

structed and prepared. But the doubt must be a reasonable one, for every slight suspicion would not suffice.[1] In any case that may occur, therefore, it is necessary to weigh the reasons carefully; but, this being done, baptism should be administered conditionally, *unless there be a moral certainty that it was previously conferred.* This is the rule laid down by St. Liguori with regard to children that are exposed;[2] and being founded on the necessity of baptism, it manifestly applies to all about whose baptism any doubt is raised.

§ XIII.—**Hæretici vero ad Catholicam Ecclesiam venientes, in quorum Baptismo debita forma aut materia servata non est, rite baptizandi sunt; sed prius errorum suorum pravitatem agnoscant et detestentur, et in Fide Catholica diligenter instruantur: ubi vero debita forma et materia servata est, omissa tantum supplicantur, nisi rationabili de causa aliter Episcopo videatur.**

455. This rubric directs what is to be done with regard to the admission into the Church of converts from any heretical community. The chief difficulty in the matter is to ascertain whether they previously received a valid baptism. It was defined by the Church, on occasion of the controversy raised in the time of St. Cyprian, that baptism administered by heretics is not on that account invalid.[3] It was decided that in receiving converts from heresy, a distinction should be made between those in whose sect baptism was administered with the proper

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 134. [2] Lib. vi. n. 135. *Secunda sententia.*
[3] Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, n. 14. *Decr. Steph.*, n. 16. *Conc. Arelat.*, n. 21. *Decret. Liber. et Siric.*

matter and form, as the Novatians, and those in whose sect it was not so administered, as the Paulianists. The latter should be baptized, not the former.[1] The rule thus laid down has been always religiously observed in the Church.

456. In forming our judgment in any proposed case, we must be guided very much by the ritual, or the authorized mode of baptizing in the sect from which the convert comes. This is clearly conveyed in the answer of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition[2] to a question regarding the validity of baptism amongst the Lutherans and Calvinists. If the essential matter and form are prescribed in the ritual, as, of necessity, to be used, we are to assume the validity of the baptism, unless there be very grave reasons for questioning it. If not, further inquiry must be made into the circumstances of the case. Should it be ascertained that the convert, of whom there is question, was, in point of fact, validly baptized, of course baptism is not to be repeated. Should it, on the other hand, be made clear that the baptism was invalid, he ought now to be baptized absolutely. But if, as is commonly the case, a reasonable doubt remains, he should be baptized conditionally.

457. The sectaries, then, may be divided into three classes—those who are certainly baptized, those who are certainly unbaptized, and those whose baptism is doubtful.

I. At the present day no one, we believe, doubts that baptism is validly conferred not only in the Greek

[1] Denzinger, nn. 16, 20, 21, 62, 63.

[2] 17 Nov. 1838, cit. apud Falise, *Sac. Rit. Cong. Decreta*, etc. V. Baptisma, in nota, n. 7. Vid. Append.

Church, but amongst the Eutychians, Nestorians, and other Oriental sects; and the same is true, according to Bouvier,[1] of the sect known in France as "*La Petite Eglise*". These sects not only use rituals which prescribe the essential matter and form, but also profess the Catholic doctrine regarding the efficacy and necessity of baptism, which is a sufficient guarantee of the care that is taken to have it properly administered. When a convert, therefore, from any of these sects is received into the Church, he is not to be baptized; but, as the rubric here directs, the ceremonies that may have been omitted, are to be supplied, unless the bishop, to whom the matter should be referred, determines otherwise. A sufficient reason for omitting to supply the ceremonies, would be the fear of exciting controversy regarding the validity of the previous baptism.[2]

II. Amongst the other sects that still retain baptism, there is not one, as far as we know, whose ritual does not prescribe the essential matter and form, so that when there is not certainty, there is ground of probability, that their baptism, if conferred at all, has been validly conferred. But in most of them may be found individuals who were never baptized, owing very often to the neglect of parents, who look upon the baptism of their children as a useless ceremony. When there is sufficient evidence of this in the case of any convert, he is of course to be baptized absolutely.

Again, some sects reject baptism altogether, as the

[1] De Bapt., cap. vi. art. 2, § 3.
[2] Catal., tit. ii. cap. iii. § xvi. n. i.

Quakers,[1] and converts from amongst them should, therefore, be baptized absolutely. The Baptists reject infant baptism, and baptize only adults who make a special profession of faith.[2] Converts from their sect are, therefore, to be baptized absolutely, unless it be known (as it may be from their own testimony), that they were baptized in adult age, in which case they are, generally speaking, baptized conditionally for the reason given below.

III. The class whose baptism is doubtful embraces almost all the sects that go under the general name of Protestants. Most of them, it is true, in their formularies, admit baptism as a sacrament, or sacred rite ordained by Christ, and prescribe all that is essential as to its matter and form. If, therefore, we had sufficient security that baptism is always administered by them in exact accordance with their rituals, we should have no reason to doubt its validity. As a matter of fact, the validity of baptism by Protestants at first was generally admitted, and when a doubt was raised in France regarding that conferred by the Calvinists, St. Pius V. decided in favour of its validity.[3] But their errors regarding the efficacy and necessity of the sacrament, gradually led to habitual carelessness and frequent substantial defects in its administration, so as to leave reasonable ground for doubting in any given case, whether it was rightly conferred. Hence the practice now received everywhere, even in Rome, of baptizing *sub conditione*, converts from Protestantism, no matter from what sect they may come.[4]

[1] Vid. Hook's *Church Dictionary*, V. Quakers. [2] Ibid. V. Baptists.
[3] Cfr. Benedict XIV., *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. vi. n. 9.
[4] Vid. Perrone, *De Baptismo*, cap. v. in nota.

Kenrick, who enters fully into this question in reference to the various sects in America, thinks that no doubt ought to be entertained about the validity of the sacrament as conferred by the Baptists; but yet, seeing that it is questioned by some whether they do not separate the immersion too much from the form, he does not quite condemn the practice of re-baptizing converts from amongst them. Having given his own opinion against it, he concludes by saying "rem sapientiorum judicio relinquimus".[1] It is usual, then, and it is the safer course, to confer conditional baptism even on these converts, unless there be satisfactory evidence that the rite was duly performed.

458. If we could have sufficient certainty about the baptism conferred in any Protestant sect at the present day, it would be about that conferred by the Anglicans, for the *Book of Common Prayer*, which contains their ritual, prescribes all that is essential to the sacrament, and moreover seems to convey the Catholic doctrine respecting its efficacy and necessity. Yet there is always sufficient reason to doubt in any particular case, whether it has been actually conferred in the manner directed by the prayer book.

A great many, probably the great majority, of the Anglican ministers repudiate the Catholic doctrine. A considerable authority amongst them, Wheatley, in his work on the *Book of Common Prayer*, denies the validity of baptism by laics, and says that the sanction given to it by the first reformers was founded on "the error they had "imbibed in the Romish Church concerning the impossi-

[1] *De Baptismo*, cap. ii. n. 119.

"bility of salvation without the sacrament of baptism".[1] Many of them simply ridicule the supposition that the salvation of a child depends on whether or not it has been washed with water. The prevalence of this error amongst them was very clearly brought out by the Gorham controversy; and the decision of the privy council on that occasion leaves it free to every minister to maintain or reject the Catholic doctrine as he pleases.[2] Since, then, the validity of the rite depends on the application by the minister of the proper matter and form with the intention of doing what the Church does, it cannot be surprising that a doubt should be entertained whether it may not have been invalidly performed by men who confessedly think it of little importance.

Again, as a matter of fact, it is very often administered in a manner which leaves its validity doubtful. It is admitted that baptism by aspersion or sprinkling is valid;[3] but if the water which is sprinkled falls merely on the dress, it is certainly null;[4] if it falls only on the hair, and does not touch the skin, the baptism is at least doubtful,[5] and the same is to be said, if not more than a drop or two should touch the skin.[6] Now it is well known that very frequently the minister contents himself with dipping his finger in the water and throwing one or two drops on the child, without much anxiety as to whether they may touch the skin, or merely fall on the dress. No doubt there are some ministers who are scrupulously exact in

[1] Appendix i. to chap. vii sec. ii. pag. 356, edition 1842.
[2] Vid. Dublin Review, No. lv. March, 1850.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 178.
[4] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 107, Quær. iii.
[5] St. Lig., ibid.
[6] Ibid, Quær. vi. Vid. supra, n. 160.

performing the ceremony as prescribed in their prayer book; and if it could be ascertained in any particular case that a convert had been baptized by one of these, he certainly should not be again baptized; but as this can be very rarely known so as to leave no reasonable doubt, it is not surprising that, as a general rule, converts from the Anglican establishment, as well as those from other Protestant sects, are baptized conditionally.

459. In this case, as well as when baptism is conferred absolutely, the ceremonies prescribed for the baptism of adults are to be observed; while those prescribed for infant baptism are to be supplied in the case of an adult Catholic who was baptized in infancy, but with the omission of the ceremonies. Both points have been decided by the Sacred Congregation.[1]

In the United States of America until recently the ceremonies prescribed for infant baptism were used in the baptism of adults also, in virtue of faculties granted by the Holy See. In 1852 these faculties were renewed only for five years, with an intimation that they should not be again renewed, and accordingly, since 1857, the American clergy are required to observe what is prescribed by the rubrics for adult baptism.[2]

460. In England, according to a decree of the first Synod of Westminster, adult converts are to be baptized privately with holy water, and without any of the ceremonies of solemn baptism: "Hujusmodi baptismus non "fiat publice sed omnino privatim, cum aqua lustrali et

[1] 27 Aug., 1836, *in Rhedonen*, ad. 3 et 4, n. 4780.

[2] Cfr. Concil. Plenarium Baltimor., *Decretum* xxiii. *et Resp. Sac. Cong.* in Appendice.

"absque cæremoniis. Confessio etiam Sacramentalis "semper in tali casu est exigenda".[1]

461. In Ireland there is no indult, as far as we know, authorizing the omission of the ceremonies of adult baptism in the case of converts; or the substitution, for them, of those prescribed for infants. The provincial synod of Dublin in 1853, has the following decree on the subject: "Cum acatholici sub conditione sunt baptizandi, "ritus in rituali pro baptismate adultorum præscripti sunt "adhibendi".[2]

462. Before he is received into the Church, the convert must acknowledge and detest his errors, and be carefully instructed in the Catholic doctrine, as the rubric here prescribes, and hence some time is necessary for the due preparation. He should make a profession of faith publicly, or at least before some witnesses, as circumstances may determine. The form used is the Creed of Pius IV., translated into the vernacular; or at least an abridgment of it, such as is given in the ritual for the use of the American clergy. We have already seen that confession is not necessary as a preparation for baptism, though a private manifestation of conscience with the view of obtaining advice and instruction is very salutary,[3] and, therefore, may be recommended even to converts who are to receive baptism absolutely.

463. Those who are certainly baptized, being already bound by the laws of the Church,[4] and coming to know, by their conversion, the obligation of confession, are clearly bound to comply with it like the other faithful, if they be

[1] Decr. xvi. 8°. [2] Decr. 11. [3] Supra, n. 445.
[4] Busenbaum, apud St. Lig., lib i. n. 154 et lib. vi. n. 665.

conscious of grievous sin, and have not, as may be supposed, confessed within the year.[1] And even though the precept of confession might not, in strictness, urge at the exact time of their reception into the Church, yet this time is manifestly most suitable for confession, because they thus not only fulfil the precept, but have an opportunity of receiving that special direction which is just then so necessary for them, and is nowhere given with so much effect as in the tribunal of penance.

464. Those whose previous baptism is doubtful, and who are to be baptized conditionally, should be at least strongly recommended to confess before receiving baptism. The doubt about their baptism of course makes it doubtful whether the sins they have hitherto committed could be the matter of sacramental confession, and, therefore, according to Lacroix,[2] they are not bound to confess those sins. St. Liguori also, although he does not speak of them in particular, appears to exempt them from the obligation by what he teaches regarding doubtful sins.[3] It is true that, if, in point of fact, those sins have been committed after baptism, they can be remitted only by perfect contrition or sacramental absolution. But the same is true of the doubtful sins of which St. Liguori speaks,[4] if, in point of fact, they have been committed, and therefore, though there is no obligation of confessing these sins, there is an obligation *either* of eliciting an act of perfect contrition, *or* of receiving sacramental absolution, by which they may be at least indirectly remitted.[5]

[1] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 668.
[2] Lib. vi. pars. i. n. 324.
[3] Lib. vi. n. 473.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Vid. St. Lig. l. c., *Recte vero advertunt.*

The very same, we think, may be said in the present case, of those who receive conditional baptism, if we consider simply what they are rigorously bound to.

465. But, in practice, they should be at least strongly recommended to confess, on account of the great advantages of such a course, if not on account of its greater safety. It seems not unreasonable to admit that there may be cases in which the doubt, though sufficient to justify conditional baptism, is not sufficient to exempt from the obligation of confessing.

The Synod of Westminster requires sacramental confession from all converts who are baptized conditionally: "Confessio etiam sacramentalis semper in tali casu est exigenda".[1] Bouvier says they are bound to this confession,[2] and as a matter of fact they always make it. Indeed we think there would be some reason to suspect the dispositions, if not even the sincerity, of a convert who would decline to make it on the ground that the obligation is doubtful.

466. The confession, as we have said, ought to precede the conditional baptism; at least this is very convenient, for the priest has thus an opportunity of giving special instruction to the convert, of exciting him to sorrow, and preparing him to receive with the proper dispositions that sacrament, whichever it be, that he is now capable of receiving.[3]

It is of no great consequence whether absolution be given before or after the baptism. Bouvier says: "Confi-

[1] *De Baptismo*, n. 8°

[2] *De Baptismo*, cap. vi. art. ii. § iii. *Cum autem.*

[3] Cfr Gury, *De Pœnitentia*, n. 420.

"teri tenetur et ab iis absolvi debet sive ante sive post "iterationem baptismi".[1] De Herdt also says: "Debent "eorum peccata confiteri et sub conditione ab iis absolvi "ante vel post baptismum".[2] But since in the regular order, baptism precedes penance, it is, reasonable that the conditional baptism should precede the conditional absolution.

The ritual published for the use of the American clergy,[3] gives the form prescribed by the Congregation of the Holy Office,[4] to be observed in receiving converts; and for those who are to be baptized conditionally, the following is the order to be observed. First—the abjuration or profession of faith. Second—conditional baptism. Third—sacramental confession, with conditional absolution.[5] This does not prevent the confession from being made before the baptism according to what has just been said; because, after the baptism, it can be repeated to the same priest in a single sentence before the conditional absolution.[6] Hence the usual practice, we believe, is, first, to hear the convert's confession, and dispose him for the worthy reception of either sacrament; then to baptize him conditionally; and lastly, having got him simply to accuse himself in general terms of the sins he has already confessed in detail, to give him conditional absolution.

467. It may be doubted how far special faculties are necessary in this case, to absolve from the sin of heresy or the excommunication annexed to it. In the first place

[1] Loc. cit.
[2] Pars. vi. n. 8.
[3] Editio Tertia, Baltimori, 1860.
[4] 20 Julii, 1859.
[5] Vid. "*Modus excipiendi*", etc., in Appendice.
[6] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 502.

the heresy may be only material, for it can hardly be doubted that amongst Protestants many are only material heretics. Reiffenstuel gives this as his opinion regarding great numbers amongst the mass of heretics.[1] The same is the opinion of Lacroix, and several other authors cited by him, with regard to the Protestants of Germany; and what is true of them is equally true of Protestants in other countries. "Some of them", he says, "are so "simple, or so prejudiced by the teaching of their minis- "ters, that they are persuaded of the truth of their own "religion; and at the same time so sincere and conscien- "tious, that if they knew it to be false, they would at "once embrace ours. Such as these are not formal, but "only material heretics, and that there are many such, is "testified by numbers of confessors in Germany, and "authors of the greatest experience. What is most de- "plorable in their case is, that, should they fall into any "other mortal sin, as may very easily happen to such "persons, they are deprived of the grace of the principal "sacraments, and are commonly lost, not through want "of faith (for I suppose them to believe what is necessary, "*necessitate medii*), but on account of other sins they "have committed, and from which they are not freed by "the sacrament of penance, which does not exist amongst "them; nor by an act of contrition or perfect charity, "which they commonly don't attend to, or think of elici- "ting (to say nothing of the very great difficulty such "men would have in doing so), thinking they are jus- "tified by faith alone and trust in Christ, and by this "accursed confidence they are miserably lost".[2]

[1] Lib. v. *Decret.* tit. vii. n. 13. [2] Lib. ii. n. 94.

It may be assumed, then, that amongst Protestants, there are a great many whose heresy is only material; and it may be added, that this is most likely to be the case with those who are converted to the faith, the very fact of their conversion being, generally speaking, an evidence of the sincerity with which they previously adhered to their errors. Now it is *formal* heresy alone (*i.e.*, heresy to which one pertinaciously adheres, though the true doctrine and the motives of its credibility are clearly proposed to him), which is reserved to the Pope, and not material heresy, even when the person is guilty of grievous sin by his neglecting to inquire when doubts occurred, or by his culpable ignorance, for this, though it may be a grievous sin against faith, is not, after all, the sin of formal heresy. It may easily happen, therefore, that no special faculty is required for the absolution of these converts.[1]

Again, since there is a doubt, as we suppose, whether they have been really baptized, there must be a doubt wheher they could incur the censures of the Church. De Lugo discusses this question, and gives it as his opinion, that when, after diligent inquiry, there remains a doubt as to the validity of the baptism of one who is guilty of heresy, he is not to be regarded as having incurred the censures attached to heresy.[2] We look on it, then, as extremely probable that the converts of whom there is question have not incurred the excommunication annexed to heresy, and since the case is reserved to the Pope de-

[1] Vid. Lacroix, lib. vi. p. ii., n. 1613. De Lugo, *De Pœnitentia*, Disp. xvi. n. 197. *De Fide*, Disp. xx. n. 174 et seq.

[2] *De Fide*, Disp. xx. n. 143.

pendently on the excommunication annexed to it,[1] and since an ordinary confessor can absolve from reserved cases when there is a doubt either as to law or fact,[2] it would seem to follow that no special faculty is required to absolve in the cases we are discussing, so far at least as the papal reservation is concerned.

468. The practice is, however, to deal with all converts from heretical sects, as if they had incurred the reserved excommunication. Kenrick observes[3] that the Church does not acknowledge, *in foro externo*, the distinction between "material" and "formal" which would exempt from the reserved censure any one living in an heretical communion, and cites a decree of the Holy Office reprehending one who, relying on that distinction, had absolved a Calvinist: "eo quod ignarus hæresum et "errorum Calvini non posset dici hæreticus formalis sed "tantum materialis".[4] The doubt whether a convert has incurred the reserved censure may be expressed in the form of absolution, as is directed in the ritual for the use of the American clergy, by inserting the word *forsan:* ". . . . a vinculo excommunicationis quam *forsan* "incurristi", etc.[5]

Although bishops cannot by their ordinary power absolve from heresy,[6] they can do so in virtue of special faculties which they usually have from the Holy See. Besides, when any one who has publicly professed heresy solemnly abjures it, and penitently returns to the Church, the bishop is authorized as delegate of the Apostolic See,

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 580.
[2] Ibid., n. 600.
[3] *De Baptismo*, n. 243.
[4] Ibid., in nota.
[5] "*Modus excipiendi*", etc.
[6] St. Lig., lib. vii. n. 88.

to absolve him, *pro foro externo*, after which he may be absolved by any confessor, *pro foro interno*;[1] or, after receiving his abjuration, he may remit him to a simple confessor, whose absolution, though only *in foro sacramentali*, avails also *pro foro externo*.[2] In these countries the bishops receive faculties to absolve from heresy, whether public or occult, and to communicate the same under certain restrictions to others.[3] When a convert from heresy, therefore, is to be received into the Church, the bishop should get notice of it, that he may himself receive him, or send the necessary faculties to the priest who is to receive him.

§ XIV.—**Cæterum legantur et serventur ea, quæ supra de Baptismo in communi præscripta sunt.**

469. The rubrics that regard the matter, form, minister, the font, the holy oils, the vestments, and other requisites, of which we have treated in a preceding chapter,[4] apply to baptism generally, and must be attended to in the baptism of adults as well as in that of infants. The present rubric refers us to them, as they are supposed, though not repeated here.

[1] Reiffenstuel, lib. v. tit. vii. n. 369. Bened. XIV. *De Synod Dioc.*, lib. ix. cap. iv. n. 3.

[2] Bened. XIV. l. c.

[3] Formul. VI^ta^ 1° et 24°.

[4] Chap. iii.

CHAPTER VI.

ORDER FOR THE BAPTISM OF ADULTS.

ORDO BAPTISMI ADULTORUM.

§ I.—In primis Sacerdos, paratis his quæ supra de observandis in administratione Sacramenti Baptismi Parvulorum dicuntur, indutus Superpelliceo et Stola, vel etiam Pluviali violacei coloris, cum suis Clericis accedit ad gradus Altaris, et genibus flexis, pia mente ad Deum preces effundit, ut tantum Sacramentum digne valeat ministrare, et ad implorandum Divinum auxilium, surgens, se signat, et si temporis ratio ferat, dicit: *Deus in adjutorium, etc.*

Postea incipiat, prosequentibus Clericis, Antiphonam. *Effundam, etc.*

470. Every thing being prepared both in the baptistery and at the church porch, in the same way as for the baptism of infants,[1] the priest puts on a surplice and violet stole, and, if convenient, a cope of the same colour. The Church wishes to have the ceremony performed with the greatest possible solemnity, and hence the rubric here recommends the use of a cope, even when it is performed by a simple priest.

471. The cope was originally a large cloak with a hood, used in processions, and designed as a protection from the rain: hence its name—*pluviale*. In shape it still

[1] Supra, chap. iii. n. xlii. et seq.

bears a resemblance to such a garment; but it is usually made of rich material, and is worn in certain functions[1] to give them greater solemnity.

472. The words of the rubric "**vel etiam pluviale**", might seem to imply that the stole may be dispensed with when the cope is used; but that such is not the meaning is clear from the general rubric regarding the administration of the sacraments,[2] and from the fact that when the bishop officiates, both stole and cope are distinctly prescribed.[3] We take it that the "**vel**" is meant to convey that it would be becoming and proper for him, though he is not required, to wear the cope in addition to the stole. It is understood in this sense by Falise.[4]

473. The priest should be attended by at least two clerics vested in surplice, or a greater number if possible.[5] When he wears a cope, he should be attended by three, and one should walk at each side holding the borders in front, while he is proceeding to the altar steps, and again while going from the altar to the porch. This is prescribed in the ceremonies to be observed in certain solemn functions in minor churches, where the priest is attended only by clerics.[6] And it seems to be a general rule that when the priest is vested in cope, and is moving to or from the altar or elsewhere, two attendants should accompany him, raising the borders of the cope on each side.

[1] Vid. Baruff., tit. xiii. n. 3 et 4. Gav., pars. i. tit. xix. lit. (d).
[2] Supra, chap. ii. § vii. [3] Infra, chap. viii. § iii.
[4] *Cours Abrégé*, para. 3me sect. 1re chap 1re § vi. n. 6.
[5] Baruff., tit. xiii. n. 6. Vid. supra, n. 126 et seq.
[6] *Memoriale Rituum*, jussu Benedicti XIII. in Festo Purific., Fer. iv. Cin., Sabbat. Sanct., etc.

This rule, we think, should be adhered to in the present ceremony.

474. All, then, having vested in the sacristy, the first clerk precedes with hands joined, and the priest, accompanied by the second and third raising the borders of his cope, goes to the altar, and having uncovered, kneels on the lowest step, the clerks kneeling with him,[1] and there implores the divine assistance in the sacred function he is about to perform, saying the "*Veni Sancte Spiritus*", etc. or some other appropriate prayer. Then rising, he says, if time permits, "*Deus in adjutorium*", etc., making on himself the sign of the cross, and proceeds with the antiphon, psalms, and prayers as in the ritual, still standing at the foot of the altar,[2] and reciting the verses of the psalms alternately with the clerks.[3] These are very appropiate to the occasion, as is shown by Catalani[4] and Baruffaldi,[5] but are not strictly prescribed, as appears from the words of the rubric itself.

§ II.—**Si plures fuerint baptizandi, hæc tertia Oratio dicatur in numero plurali.**

475. When two or more are baptized together, the last prayer, "*Da quæsumus*", etc., is said in the plural, that is, we say "*Electis nostris . . . . edocti*", etc., in the masculine gender, unless *all* be females. This is expressly prescribed in the rubric which precedes the prayer in the Pontifical. The words are "**In plurali pro pluribus et in genere masculino nisi omnes sint fœminæ**".[6] The same rule is to be followed in all the prayers.

[1] Rit. Toul., tit. III^me^ § i. n. 1.
[2] Baruff., tit. xiii. n. 8.
[3] Rit. Toul., n. 2,
[4] Tit. ii. cap. iv. § i. n. ii.
[5] Loc. cit. n. 10.
[6] *Pontificalis Ritus. pro Bapt. Adultorum.*

476. Those who are to be baptized are frequently throughout the ceremony, called in the rubrics "Electi". We have already mentioned[1] the classes into which, according to Catalani, the catechumens were distributed. Those who, after the scrutinies, were judged sufficiently prepared to receive baptism, were called "Competentes" or "Electi"; but, according to Baruffaldi,[2] we must distinguish between the two, as they were not called "Electi", but on the very day on which they received baptism.

§ III.—**Deinde Sacerdos procedit ad fores Ecclesiæ, et stat in limine, catechizandus vero extra limen. Et si sunt plures, mares et fœminæ, illi ad dexteram Sacerdotis, hæ vero ad sinistram statuantur. Sacerdos interrogat:** *Quo nomine vocaris?* **Catechumenus respondet: N. Sacerdos: N.** *Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei?* **Respondet:** *Fidem.* **Sacerdos:** *Fides quid tibi præstat?* **Respondet:** *Vitam æternam.* **Sacerdos:** *Si vis habere, etc.*

477. Having concluded the psalms and prayers at the foot of the altar, he takes his cap, and having made a profound inclination, or a genuflection, if the Blessed Sacrament be present in the tabernacle, the clerks genuflecting in any case, he puts on his cap, and proceeds to the porch of the church, where the person or persons to be baptized should be already in waiting.[3]

478. If there should be males and females to be baptized at the same time, they ought to be placed so that the former be on the right, and the latter on the left of the

[1] Supra, n. **421.** [2] Loc. cit. n. 13, 14.
[3] Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 5. Vid. supra, n. **288.**

priest, as the rubric here expressly directs. The priest then puts the interrogations as they are in the ritual.[1] The answers are to be given, not by the sponsors, as in infant baptism, but by the catechumens themselves, who should be between the sponsors, each one having his or her godfather on the right and godmother on the left.[2] The first question regards the name which he is now to take in baptism, and not that by which he may have been previously known.[3]

It may be seen that, in the address of the priest "*Si "vis habere vitam*", etc., we have at the end an extract from the Athanasian Creed which is not found in the order of infant baptism.

§ IV.—**Et rursus interrogat: N.** *Abrenuntias Satanæ? etc.*

Deinde Sacerdos interrogat de Symbolo Fidei, dicens: *Credis in Deum, etc.*

479. We have already treated of the renunciation of Satan and the interrogations on the Creed, in the order of infant baptism.[4]

§ V.—**Tunc Sacerdos exsufflet ter in faciem ejus, semel dicens:** *Exi, etc.*

Hic in modum Crucis halet in faciem ipsius, et dicat: N. *Accipe, etc.*

480. The great antiquity of the exsufflations used in baptism, and their mystic meaning, have been already

[1] Vid. supra, n. 297 et seq.
[2] Rit. Toul., tit. III^me^ § i. n. 5.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 291 et seq.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 332 et n. 340.

noticed.[1] The rubrics here plainly distinguish between "exsufflet" and "halet", the former signifying that he blows, the latter that he breathes, on the face, having the mouth, in the one case, nearly closed, and in the other, wide open.

This ceremony of breathing on the face is not mentioned in the order of infant baptism. As the cross should be formed by the breath exhaled, the priest must move his head so as to describe it. He cannot of course pronounce the words while he is thus exhaling his breath; and it would seem from the position of the cross as marked in the ritual after the word "*benedictionem*", that he should first say the words and then perform the ceremony.

§ VI.—**Deinde facit Crucem cum pollice in ejus fronte, et in pectore, dicens: N.** *Accipe, etc.*

481. The forehead and breast are signed in the manner already explained in treating of infant baptism,[2] the ceremony here being exactly the same, though the form of words is much longer. The Ritual of Toulon[3] here observes that it is not necessary to have the breast uncovered.

§ VII.—**Et si Catechumenus venit de Gentilitatis errore sive de Ethnicis et Idololatris, dicat:** *Horresce idola, respue simulacra.*

Si ex Hebræis, dicat: *Horresce Judaicam perfidiam, respue Hebraicam superstitionem.*

[1] Supra, n. 302 et seq.
[2] Supra, n. 307.
[3] Loc. cit. n. 9. Vid. supra, n. 308.

Si ex Mahumetanis, dicat: *Horresce Mahumeticam perfidiam, respue pravam sectam infidelitatis.*

Si ex Hæreticis, et in ejus baptismo debita forma servata non sit, dicat: *Horresce hæreticam pravitatem, respue nefarias sectas impiorum.* **N. Exprimens proprio nomine sectam, de qua venit. Inde prosequatur:** *Cole Deum, etc.*

482. The above is the form in which these rubrics are given in the latest Propaganda edition of the ritual. In many other editions, they are given in a somewhat different form, but what they prescribe is exactly the same.

The directions as to the change to be made in one clause, according to the errors which the catechumen renounces, are so clear as to require no explanation.

§ VIII.—Si plures sunt Electi, omnia supradicta dicuntur singillatim super singulos.

483. Should there be a number baptized together, the priest must go through the preceding interrogations and ceremonies with each separately, commencing with the males.[1]

There is no doubt that the priest, having reached the door of the church, should stand facing the catechumens. If, therefore, we suppose that, while he is in that position, the males are on his right, and the females on his left, as a preceding rubric[2] might naturally enough be understood to require, he must either commence with the male on his extreme right, and proceed from right to left, which would be reversing the order usually observed in

[1] Rit. Toul., n. 11.

[2] Supra, § iii. n. 478.

such circumstances, as *e.g.*, in giving Holy Communion, when he is expressly directed by the rubric to commence with those on the Epistle side;[1] or he must commence with the first male on his left, and proceed to the last on his right, and then pass to the females, commencing with the one on his extreme left. We would prefer the latter course, but it occurs to us that the rubric should rather be understood of the right and left of the priest, while he is standing, not opposite to, but in the same line with, or looking in the same direction as, the catechumens. We think this more probable; first, because of the inconvenience just mentioned as following from the other interpretation; and secondly, because according to the other interpretation, the males would be on the left of the females, and therefore in the less honourable place, while the design of the rubric is, according to Catalani[2] and Baruffaldi,[3] to give them the more honourable place.

§ IX.—**Si plures sint Electi, præcedens Oratio dicatur in numero plurali. Sequentes autem signationes fiant cum suis verbis singillatim super singulos.**

484. The priest should be uncovered in saying the prayer "*Te deprecor*", etc.[4] When there are more than one, it should be said for all in common and in the plural number. There is a change of gender only when all are females, according to what has been said above.[5]

At the end of the prayer, the priest puts on his cap,[6]

[1] Merati, pars. ii. tit. ix. Rub. 6. n. xxvi. Vid. infra, chap. xii. § v.
[2] Tit. ii. cap. iv. § v. n. iii.
[3] Tit. xiii. n. 19.
[4] Rit. Toul., tit. iii^me § i. n. 11.
[5] Supra, n. 475.
[6] Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 12.

and proceeds to make the following signs of the cross, which are here directed to be made on each in case there be a number.

§ X.—**Deinde signet Electum signo Crucis cum pollice in fronte, dicens:** *Signo tibi, etc.* . . . **In auribus.** . . . **In oculis.** . . . **In naribus.** . . . **In ore.** . . . **In pectore.** . . . **In scapulis.** . . . **In toto corpore, illud non tangens, manu producit signum Crucis, et dicit:** *Signo te totum, etc.* . . . *Oremus. Preces nostras, etc.*

485. The signs of the cross here prescribed are not found in the order for infants; but they are prescribed in very ancient rituals.[1] The form used with each sign in the present ceremony explains its meaning and object. We may observe that the signs are made on each of the ears, eyes, and nostrils, in the same way as in anointing those parts in extreme unction.[2] The ritual of Toulon not only directs this, but has two crosses marked at each, to show that they are double organs;[3] and the same authority[4] observes that the signs on the breast and shoulders may be made outside the dress. In signing the whole body, the cross should be formed with the hand in front of the catechumen, but not touching him, three times, as marked in the ritual, *i.e*, once at the name of each person of the Blessed Trinity. The first line should be drawn vertically from the person's head as low as convenient, and the second intersecting it across the breast, or from his right to his left shoulder.

§ XI.—**Tunc imponit manum super caput Electi, et dicit:** *Oremus. Omnipotens, etc.*

[1] Catal. tit. ii. cap. iv. § xiii. n. i. Vid. supra, n. 305 et seq.
[2] Baruff., tit. xiii. n. 39. [3] Tit. iii^me § i. n. 12. [4] Ibid.

Si plures sint, hæc, et præcedens Oratio, *Preces nostras, etc.*, **dicantur in numero plurali.**

486. After the signs of the cross made as directed in the preceding rubric, the priest uncovers.[1] Then follow three prayers, the first of which is the same as that used in infant baptism, except a slight change in one clause. Before reciting the third prayer (which is also the same as that used in infant baptism, with the addition of one clause at the end "*ut idoneus*", etc.), he is directed to impose his hand on the head of the catechumen; he should use his right hand, and it is enough that he hold it over, it is not required that he touch, the head.[2] Should a number be baptized together, this prayer and the prayer, "*Preces* "*nostras*", etc., are ordered to be said in the plural. No mention is made of the second prayer "*Deus qui humani* "*generis*", etc., probably because it serves equally for one or more without any change. It is to be observed, however, that if there be a number, the hand must be imposed on the head of each, as is here noted by Catalani[3] and is expressly directed in the rubric of the Pontifical, which runs thus: "**(Singulis) Tunc imponit manum super** "**caput Electi et stans sine mitra dicit; (In plurali pro** "**pluribus).** *Oremus. Omnipotens sempiterne, etc.*[4]

§ XII.—**Deinde Sacerdos benedicit sal.**

487. On this rubric see what has been said before.[5]

§ XIII.—**Quod si Catechumenus fuerit Gentilis, sive ex**

[1] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 13.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 210.
[3] Tit. ii. cap. iv. § xv. n. iii.
[4] *Pro. Bapt. Adultorum.*
[5] Supra, n. 270 et seq. n. 311 et seq.

Idololatris venerit ad Fidem; benedictio sale, antequam ejus medicinam gustet, Sacerdos addat sequentem Orationem, quæ tamen pro venientibus ex Hebræis vel aliis, ut supra, non dicitur. *Oremus. Domine Sancte, etc.*

488. When the catechumen is a convert from idolatry this prayer is said immediately after the blessing of the salt, and before it is administered. When there are two or more such catechumens the prayer is said in the plural, but should there be one or more of them amongst a number of others, we think the salt should be administered to the others first, then after this prayer, "*Domine sancte*", etc., to the converts from idolatry, and, lastly, when it has been administered to all, the following prayer, "*Deus Patrum nostrorum*", etc., should be said in the plural. By following this order, the prayer,"*Domine sancte*", etc., cannot even appear to have reference to any except those for whom it is specially intended.

§ XIV.—**Tunc pollice et indice accipit de ipso sale, et immittit in os Catechumeni dicens: N.** *Accipe sal, etc.* **Sacerdos:** *Pax tibi, etc. Oremus. Deus Patrum nostrorum, etc.*

Si plures sint dicatur singulis: N. *Accipe sal, etc*, **et præcedentes orationes, in numero plurali.**

489. In some editions of the Roman Ritual this rubric immediately follows the blessing of the salt, and is placed before the preceding rubric "**Quod si Catechumenus**", etc. It is so placed by Baruffaldi and Catalani in their commentaries.[1]

The quantity of blessed salt usually given to infants

[1] Baruff. tit. xiii. § xiv., xv. Catal. tit. ii. cap. iv. § xviii, xix.

suffices for adults also, but we may observe that there need not be so much anxiety about it, as there is less danger of doing injury to adults. Even the rubric here has not the word "**modicum**" which it has in speaking of the quantity to be given to infants.[1]

It is to be administered to each in case there be a number, and then the prayer, "*Deus Patrum*", etc., is to be said in the plural for all together.

§ XV.—**Si inter Catechumenos adsint fœminæ recedant ipsæ in partem quousque tertio dicatur masculis:** *Ora Electe, etc.*, **et hi signati fuerint in fronte.**

490. This rubric is not given in some editions of the Ritual, nor is it mentioned by Baruffaldi or Catalani; and the same is to be said of the similar rubrics which occur afterwards.[2] It is given, however, in the Propaganda edition,[3] as well as in the Pontifical, and it is manifestly important for the decorous performance of the ceremonies that the females should here be required to withdraw, as the ceremonies and prayers, which immediately follow, are for males exclusively.

§ XVI.—**Si plures sint Catechumeni hic et in sequentibus Sacerdos dicat in numero plurali:** *Orate Electi, flectite genua, etc.*

Deinde Sacerdos dicat super masculum tantum: *Ora Electe, flecte genua, et dic. Pater Noster.* **Et Electus genuflexus orat, et dicit:** *Pater Noster.* **Et cum oraverit, et dixerit** *Pater Noster* **usque ad** *Sed libera nos a malo*

[1] Supra, n. 314. [2] Infra, § xx., et § xxii.

[3] Rome, MDCCCXLVII.

inclusive, Sacerdos subjungit: *Leva, comple orationem tuam, et dic. Amen.* Et ille respondet: *Amen.* Et Sacerdos dicit Patrino: *Signa eum.* Deinde Electo: *Accede.* Et Patrinus pollice signat eum in fronte dicens: *In Nomine Patris, etc.*

491. The first part of this rubric, "Si plures sint", etc., directing the change to be made when there are more than one, is given in many editions, and in the commentaries of Baruffaldi and Catalani, only after the prayer and exorcism, but it is much more conveniently placed here.

The catechumen should kneel on both knees while reciting the "Pater noster". This is the obvious meaning of the rubric "flecte genua". Nor is there any instance of a prayer directed to be said on one knee. The reasoning of Gavantus on the words "Flectamus genua", of the Missal,[1] does not apply in this case, as Baruffaldi observes.[2] Besides, in the Missal the priest is directed to say the prayer only *after* the genuflexion.[3] He rises up before saying "*Amen*", which he is to say only after the priest has directed him to do so. When the priest says "*Accede*", the catechumen should advance a step, and then the godfather makes the sign of the cross on his forehead, saying the words, *In nomine Patris*, etc., as directed in the rubric. The signs of the cross here prescribed are made in the manner before explained.[4]

It is obviously necessary that the godfather and the catechumen himself be instructed beforehand in what they are here required to do.

[1] Pars. ii. tit. v., Rub. 4, lit e.
[2] Tit. xiii. n. 44.
[3] Missal. Rubr., l. c.
[4] Supra, n. 307.

§ XVII.—**Tum quoque Sacerdos facit Crucem in fronte ejus, ita dicendo:** *In Nomine, etc.* **Et imponit manum super eum, et dicit:** *Oremus. Deus Abraham, etc.*

492. Immediately after the godfather, the priest makes the sign of the cross on the catechumen's forehead, in the same manner, and with the same words. Then he imposes his right hand on him, and says the prayer, "*Deus Abraham*", etc., and, having put on his cap,[1] the exorcism which immediately follows. The wording of the rubric here is to be carefully noted. It requires him to say: "*In nomine Patris*", etc., while making the sign of the cross, but it does not require him to keep the hand imposed while saying the prayer "*Deus Abraham*", etc. For the former it has: **ita dicendo:** for the latter **imponit . . et dicit.** At least it is not improbable that the difference of expression is intended to convey this difference of meaning, seeing that if there be a number, the imposition of the hand must precede the prayer.[2]

493. When there are two or more male catechumens, he addresses them in the plural, *Orate*, etc., as has been directed above,[3] but the sign of the cross is made on them singly. Then he imposes his hand on each, and having done this, he says the preceding prayer and exorcism in the plural, as is clearly directed in the Pontifical. It is to be observed, however, that at the words, *sanctæ Crucis* ✠, in the exorcism, he makes the sign of the cross on the forehead of each, and then continues, as is also clearly prescribed in the Pontifical, which has the

[1] Rit. Toul. tit. iii. § i. n. 19. [2] Vid. supra, n. **486.**
[3] Supra, § xvi. [4] Pontif. Rom., *Pro Baptismo Adultorum.*

rubric "**Signat singulos**" immediately before the words, "*Quod nos fronti*", etc.[1]

§ XVIII.—**Sacerdos dicit secundo Electo:** *Ora Electe, etc.*

494. The same ceremony is repeated with a different prayer and exorcism. The signs of the cross and the imposition of the hand are to be "**Singulis**", but the prayer and exorcism to be "**In plurali pro pluribus**", as is expressly prescribed by the rubric of the Pontifical.[2]

§ XIX.—**Sacerdos tertio dicit Electo:** *Ora, etc.*

495. The ceremony is performed for the third time with two exorcisms, the second being a repetition of the one given above, "*Ergo maledicte*", etc. In reciting the first: "*Exorcizo te immunde*", etc., the sign of the cross is to be made over the catechumen three times, as marked in the ritual. Should there be a number, it can be made over all in common, as is clear from the Pontifical,[3] but the imposition of the hand which precedes, must be "**singulis**", as before.[3]

The priest is uncovered except during the exorcisms, when he wears his cap.[4]

§ XX.—**Si ut supra, adsint fœminæ, retrahunt se masculi in partem, et accedunt fœminæ ante Sacerdotem et stant.**

496. This rubric is not given in some editions of the ritual, as has been already noticed.[5]

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Rubr. in loc. [3] Supra, n. **493.**
[4] Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 20, 21. [5] Supra, n **490.**

§ XXI.—**Si plures fuerint fœminæ Catechumenæ, hic et in sequentibus, Sacerdos dicat in numero plurali:** *Orate, Electæ, flectite genua, etc.*

Sacerdos dicit Catechumenæ: *Ora, Electa, flecte genua, etc.*

497. The preceding ceremonies are prescribed also for females, but with prayers and exorcisms somewhat different. All that we have said above regarding the signs of the cross and the imposition of the hand, is equally applicable here. It is very convenient to have the prayers and exorcisms for the females given at length in their proper places, as they are in the Pontifical and in the Propaganda edition of the Ritual. In many editions of the ritual we have here only the prayer and exorcism that are proper, and we are referred to the preceding for those that are the same for both males and females.

§ XXII.—**Postmodum accedunt iterum masculi qui se retraxerant, et ipsi ad dexteram, fœminæ vero ad sinistram Sacerdotis, ut in principio, disponuntur.**

498. This rubric is not found in the older editions of the ritual.[1] The male catechumens, who were before directed to withdraw, are now invited to come forward, and are placed on the right, as at the commencement,[2] the rest of the ceremony being the same for all.

§ XXIII.—**Sacerdos imponit manum super Electum, vel in sint, plures, super singulos tam masculos, quam fœminas et dicit:** *Æternam ac justissimam, etc.*

[1] Vid. supra, n. 490.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 483.

Si plures fuerint Electi, sive mares, sive fœminæ, præcedens oratio dicatur in numero plurali, et in genere proprio, ut superius dictum est.

499. After the preceding ceremonies, if there be only one catechumen, whether male or female, the priest, having taken off his cap,[1] imposes his hand, and then says the prayer, "*Æternam*", etc. But if there be a number, they are arranged as above directed, and the priest imposes his hand on the head of each, and then says for all in common, in the plural number, but in the masculine gender, unless *all* be females, the prayer "*Æternam*", etc.[2]

§ XXIV.—**His peractis, Sacerdos sinistra manu apprehendens dexteram Electi prope brachium, vel ei porrigens extremam partem stolæ, introducit eum in Ecclesiam, dicens: N.** *Ingredere, etc.*

500. Up to this time, the catechumen is supposed to be outside the church, and he is now conducted inside with the ceremony here mentioned. The priest with his left hand takes him by the right, almost by the wrist—"**prope brachium**", (brachium being the part of the arm between the elbow and the hand),[3] or he presents to him the extremity of the stole, to be held in his right hand, and in this manner leads him in to the church, saying: "**N.** "*Ingredere*", etc. The priest is free to adopt either way; but Baruffaldi recommends that the extremity of the stole be used when females alone are baptized.[4] In the order for the baptism of infants, no choice of the kind is given,

[1] Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 21.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 365.
[3] Smith's *Latin Dictionary*.
[4] Tit. xiii. n 51.

for it is prescribed, as we have seen,[1] that he put the extremity of his stole on the child.

501. The ritual nowhere states which extremity is meant, but the rubric of the Pontifical here distinctly says, it is that which hangs from the left shoulder. The reason why the priest uses the left hand, or the left side of the stole, is, according to Baruffaldi,[2] that he may have the right hand free, or that he himself may be at the right, which is the more honourable position.

§ XXV.—**Si plures fuerint, dicat in numero plurali:** *Ingredimini, etc.*, **et introducat eos, ut supra.**

502. When there are two or more together, he addresses them in the plural "*Ingredimini*", etc. If all are females, he presents the end of the stole, and if there be not more than two or three, each may take hold of it, otherwise the first takes it, the second takes the hand of the first, the third that of the second, and so on. If all are males, each may hold the stole in the same way, when there are only two or three, otherwise they hold each other's hands, while the priest, with his left hand, takes the first by the wrist as above explained. If some are males and some females, they take each other's hands in line, while he takes with his left hand the first of the males. This is the manner recommended by Baruffaldi,[3] and implied, as we understand it, in the rubric of the Pontifical, which is as follows: "**Si autem baptizandi erint plures, Pontifex "vel porrigit singulis extremam partem stolæ, vel trahit "illum quem manu tenet, et ille secundum, et secundus "tertium, etc., pariformiter ducat**".[4]

[1] Chap. iv. § ix. [2] Loc. cit. n. 53. [3] Loc. cit. n. 52.
[4] *Pro Baptismo Adultorum*, Rub. in loc.

It may be seen on a little reflection, that, in the third case we have mentioned, *i.e.*, when there are persons of both sexes, the males should be on the right of the females, in order that the priest may be on the right of all;[1] and this confirms the view before expressed,[2] regarding their relative position.

§ XXVI.—**Et ingressus Electus procumbit, seu prosternit se in pavimento, et adorat.**

Deinde surgit, et Sacerdos imponit manum super caput ejus, et Electus cum eo recitat Symbolum Apostolorum, et Orationem Dominicam.

Ita etiam si plures fuerint, omnes surgunt et simul recitant: *Credo in Deum, etc.*

503. As soon as the catechumen has entered the church, he is directed to prostrate himself on the pavement, and in this posture to adore God, thanking Him for His mercy in having called him to the faith, and having now permitted him to enter His holy temple to receive the grace of regeneration, etc.[3] The prostration is only for some seconds, when he rises, and the priest imposes his (right) hand on his head, and then both together recite the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

The same thing is required of each when there are more than one. All prostrate themselves and rise up at the same time, and the priest imposes his hand on the head of each; after which all together, the priest included, say the Creed and Pater Noster.[4]

504. In the order for infants it is prescribed that the priest and sponsors recite these in going to the font. This

[1] Supra, n. **501.**
[2] Supra, n. **483.**
[3] Catal., tit. ii. cap. iv. § xxxv.
[4] Pontif. Rom. *De Bapt. Adult.*

is not expressed here, but it seems to be implied in the rubric of the Pontifical which says "**Interim**", that is, as we take it, while reciting the Creed and Pater Noster. "**Interim Pontifex accedit ad faldistorium extra Baptis-"terium, et versis renibus ostio cancellorum, accepta "mitra et adhuc stans (singulis si plures) imponit rursus "manum super caput Electi et dicat: (In plurali pro "pluribus).** *Nec te latet Satana, etc*".

We think, then, that the ceremonies which immediately follow here are performed at the entrance of the baptistery. If the sponsors have not finished the Creed and Pater Noster before reaching it, they stand looking towards the high altar until they have concluded,[1] and then the priest, having put on his cap,[2] proceeds as is directed in the following rubric.

§ XXVII.—**Tunc rursus Sacerdos imponat manum super caput Electi, et dicat: Exorcismus.** *Nec te latet, Satana, etc.*

Similiter si plures fuerint, imponit manum super capita singulorum, et dicit eumdem Exorcismum in numero multitudinis, et genere suo.

505. When there are several, the hand is to be imposed on the head of each, and, this being done, the priest says the exorcism for all in the plural.

In the rubric as given by Baruffaldi, the words, "**in numero multitudinis, et genere suo**", are omitted, and he observes that it requires the exorcism to be said for each in particular, and does not allow it to be said in general for all, adding reasons why this should be so.[3] He was probably led into this mistake by the omission of the

[1] Vid. supra, n. 326.
[2] Rit. Toul., tit. III^me § i. n. 27.
[3] Tit. xiii. n. 59.

last words in the ritual he had before him, and therefore, may not deserve the censure passed on him by Catalani.[1] At all events the words of the rubric, as we have it, make it clear enough that, in case there be a number, the exorcism should be said in the plural for all in common; and if there could be any doubt, it is removed by the very explicit rubric of the Pontifical, which we have cited above.[2]

§ XXVIII.—**Postea Sacerdos pollice accipit de saliva oris sui, et tangit aures et nares Electi; tangendo vero aurem dexteram et sinistram, dicat:** *Ephpheta, quod est, Adaperire;* **deinde tangendo nares, dicat:** *in odorem suavitatis*: **et subdit:** *Tu autem, etc.*

506. The ceremony here prescribed is the very same as that prescribed for infants, and is performed in the same manner.[3]

§ XXIX.—**Deinde interroget Electum:** *Quis vocaris?* **Et ipse respondet: N. Interroget: N.** *Abrenuntias, etc.*

507. The interrogations here, except the first, are the same as in the order for infants.[4] Baruffaldi has several conjectural reasons[5] why the first question is put, though the priest was told the name at the commencement, and has just used it in the exorcism. One reason which seems to him very probable, is, that sometimes the preceding ceremonies were all performed by inferior ministers, after which the bishop himself conferred the sacrament,

[1] Cap. iv. § xxxix. n. ii.
[2] Supra, n. **504.**
[3] Supra, n. **327,** et seq.
[4] Vid. supra, n. **332.**
[5] Tit. xiii. n. 61.

commencing at this part by asking the name.[1] The renunciations, however, were also required before.[2] It may be that the repetition of all these questions is simply for the purpose of making sure of the catechumen's dispositions in embracing the Christian religion.[3]

§ XXX.—Tunc Sacerdos intingit pollicem dextræ manus in Oleo sancto Catechumenorum, et inungit Electum, primum in pectore, deinde inter scapulas in modum Crucis, dicens: *Ego te linio, etc.*

Mox bombacio, vel re simili, tergit pollicem et loca inuncta, et subjungit, dicens: *Exi immunde, etc.*

508. This ceremony has been fully explained before.[4] We may observe that the reason there given for wiping the oil from the breast before anointing the back in the case of infants, does not apply here. The catechumen stands upright, having the breast and shoulders uncovered: and there is no reason why, in turning for the unction on the back, his breast should come in contact with anything to remove the oil.

Hic Sacerdos deponat stolam et pluviale violaceum et sumat aliud albi coloris.

§ XXXI.—Quando plures sunt Electi, idem fit circa singulos eorum. Et ducitur Electus ad Baptisterium: ubi, si ob aliquam causam non habeatur, sive præparata non fuerit aqua Baptismalis, fiat benedictio Fontis, ut infra ponitur. Et cum fuerit prope Fontem, Sacerdos interrogat: *Quis vocaris, etc.*

509. The above ceremonies are performed at the en-

[1] Vid. infra, chap. viii. § v.
[2] Supra, § iv.
[3] Cfr. Catal, § xli. n. i.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 333 et seq.

trance to the baptistery, and the catechumen is then conducted within the rails[1] to the font. The present rubric directs that they be performed for each, should there be a number, but it is not easy to determine whether the exorcism: *Exi immunde*, etc., is to be said for each individually, or for all in common. The words of our rubric "**Idem fit circa singulos**", leave a doubt, and the rubric of the Pontifical does not remove it. It merely gives in brackets the words (**Singulos si plures**), before *Ego te linio*, etc., and then the rubric "**Mox bombacio**", etc., is inserted before the exorcism just as we have it here, so that we cannot be sure whether the (**Singulos si plures**), any more than the words of our rubric, extend to the exorcism. We are inclined to the opinion that they do not, and that the exorcism may be said for a number in common. Our reasons are, first, because this is the case with all the exorcisms which precede; even those that are peculiar to one sex, are said in common for all of that sex, if there be a number: and, secondly, because the rubric here directs him to wipe his thumb as well as the parts anointed, before he says the exorcism; and it is not probable that this would be required until he had anointed all. Nor is it any objection that the Pontifical, which is so very minute in this particular, gives no notice that the exorcism may be for a number in common; because this notice is given by words (**in plurali pro pluribus**), which would be out of place here, as the present exorcism admits no change of number.

Catalani,[2] however, understands the rubric as directing

[1] Vid. Supra, n. 243.

[2] Cap. iv. § xliv. n. 1.

the exorcism to be applied to each, and as we have seen no other authority on the subject, we should be unwilling to depart from his view of it.

510. The rubric which here requires the stole and cope of violet to be exchanged for a stole and cope of white, is not found in the older editions of the ritual; but even in these it is understood from the order for infants,[1] and is comprehended under the general rubric placed at the commencement of the present order.[2] Should it happen, by any accident, that there is not a sufficient supply of baptismal water, even with the expedient permitted by the rubric,[3] the font must here be blessed in the manner afterwards directed.[4] In this case the violet vestments are retained till after the benediction of the font.[5]

§ XXXII.—**Iterum interroget, dicens: N.** *Quid petis? etc.*

511. The object of these interrogations and of those that immediately precede, is, according to Baruffaldi,[6] to elicit anew from the catechumen a profession of his faith and a declaration of his desire to receive baptism, so that there might be no doubt about his dispositions at this solemn moment, when the sacrament is about being conferred.

§ XXXIII.—**Tunc Patrino, vel Matrina, vel utroque (si ambo admittantur), admota manu, tenente seu tangente Electum (vel Electam) aperto capite, et laxatis a collo vestibus, inclinatum, Sacerdos vasculo vel urceolo hauriat**

[1] Chap. iv. § xv.
[2] Supra, § i.
[3] Vid. supra, chap. iii. § v.
[4] Infra, chap. ix.
[5] Rit. Toul., tit. III^me^ § i. n. 31. Vid. infra, chap. ix. § ii.
[6] Tit. xiii. n. 64.

aquam Baptismalem de fonte, et cum ea sub trina supra caput in modum Crucis infusione baptizet Electum (seu Electam) in nomine SS. Trinitatis, sic dicens: *Ego te baptizo, etc.*

512. On this rubric we have little to add to what has been said regarding the baptism of infants. The catechumen should be between his sponsors, the godfather on the right and the godmother on the left,[1] holding him by the arm or shoulder, or at least touching him. In this position he inclines forward, his head and neck uncovered, and his hands joined,[2] while the priest pours on the water in the manner explained in treating of infant baptism.[3] If the hair be thick, care should be taken to adopt the precaution before recomended.[4]

§ XXXIV.—**Si aqua, quæ ex capite baptizati defluit, non dilabitur in sacrarium Baptisterii, recipiatur in subjecta aliqua pelvi, et in illud postmodum projiciatur.**

513. If there be, adjoining the font, or forming one of its compartments, in the manner already explained,[5] a basin which serves as a sacrarium, the catechumen should keep his head inclined over it, so that the water poured on may fall into it; otherwise a vessel should be held under his head by one of the clerks, and its contents afterwards thrown into the sacrarium.[6]

514. Our rubric does not say whether the catechumen should stand or kneel. This, we think, must be determined by circumstances. The Pontifical directs that

[1] Rit. Toul., l. c. n 33.
[2] Rit. Toul., ibid.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 343 et seq.
[4] Supra, n. 345.
[5] Supra, n. 245.
[6] Vid. supra, chap. iii. § xii.

he be on his knees with his head bent forward; but this is probably because the bishop is seated on the fald-stool while pouring on the water.[1] Baruffaldi[2] supposes him to stand; and this is perhaps the more convenient posture when the ceremony is performed by a priest.

§ XXXV.—**Cum plures sunt Electi, singillatim singuli interrogantur, et baptizantur, ut supra.**

Si sunt mares et fœminæ, primum mares, deinde fœminæ.

515. This rubric appears to convey that, when there are more than one, the interrogations should immediately precede the baptism of each. It would not be in exact accordance with it, to put the interrogations to each in the first place, and then baptize.

§ XXXVI.—**Verum si probabiliter dubitetur an Electus fuerit alias baptizatus, dicat Sacerdos:** *Si non es baptizatus, etc.*

516. We have already dwelt on the circumstances in which the conditional form is to be used.[3]

§ XXXVII.—**Deinde Sacerdos intingat pollicem dexterum in sacrum Chrisma, et perungat verticem Electi in modum Crucis, dicens:** *Deus Omnipotens, etc.*

517. This rubric has been explained in the order of infant baptism.[4]

[1] Vid. infra, chap. viii. § iv.
[2] Tit. xiii. n. 70.
[3] Supra, n. 173 et seq.
[4] Vid. chap. iv. § xxi.

§ XXXVIII.—**Tunc bombacio, vel re simili pollicem tergit, et imponit capiti Electi Chrismale, seu candidum linteolum, et dat illi vestem candidam, dicens:** *Accipe vestem, etc.*

518. We may observe in the first place, that the rubric here directs the priest to wipe his thumb, but does not tell him to wipe the part to which he has applied the chrism, as he is directed to do in the order for infants.[1] Instead of this, he is directed to bind on the head of the neophyte a piece of white linen, which being designed as a protection and a mark of respect for the holy chrism, is called "**Chrismale**", and according to the ancient usage, was worn by the neophyte for seven days.[2] This, though so clearly prescribed, is rarely attended to, the chrism being usually rubbed off in the same way as in the baptism of infants.[3] The Ritual of Toulon even directs that it be rubbed off by the priest, or by some one in holy orders, though it at the same time prescribes the "Chris-"male".[4] The priest then presents him with a white garment, saying: "*Accipe vestem*", etc.

§ XXXIX.—**Et Electus deponit priores vestes, et induitur novis albi coloris, vel saltem exteriore candida, quam a Sacerdote accepit.**

519. On the white garments worn by the newly baptized, see what has been said in a previous chapter.[5] The neophyte is here directed to take off the clothes he has

[1] Supra, chap. iv. § xxii.
[2] Cfr. Catalani, *Pontificale Romanum*, pars. i. tit. i. § viii. n. i.
[3] Vid. supra, n 351.
[4] Tit. III^me § i. n. 36.
[5] Supra, n. 352 et seq.

worn up to the present, and put on white ones; or at least to put on as an outside garment that one which he has received from the priest. Of course, arrangements should be made for all this beforehand, and the sponsors should render assistance in this change of dress, but only to those of their own sex.[1] To avoid the trouble of this ceremony, the catechumens sometimes presented themselves clothed in white at the commencement. This practice, which prevailed even in Rome, was condemned as an abuse by a constitution of Benedict XIII., who ordered the strict observance of the rubric.[2] Baruffaldi says they sometimes presented themselves, as he himself was witness, having over the white garments a dark-coloured cloak or veil, which was laid aside at this part, so that they at once appeared clothed in white; but he condemns this practice, and insists on a strict observance of the rubric, which requires a change of dress. He would be satisfied, however, with the change of the outside garments, at least in females.[3]

Notwithstanding all this, it would seem that in Rome the catechumens are still presented for baptism clothed in white. At least this was the case in the church of St. John Lateran on Easter Saturday, 1855, according to the author of the "*Cérémonial des Evêques Expliqué*".[4]

§ XL.—**Postea dat ei Sacerdos cereum, seu candelam accensam in manu dextera, dicens:** *Accipe lampadem, etc.*

520. On this ceremony see what has been said in the

[1] Baruff., tit. xiii. n. 76.
[2] Apud. Baruff., n. 74.
[3] Loc. cit. n. 77 et seq.
[4] Lib. ii. cap. xxvii. n. 18 in nota.

order of infant baptism.[1] The candle is here put into the hand of the neophyte himself, and not into that of the sponsor, as is usually done in the case of infants.

§ XLI.—**Ipse vero Neophytus eumdem cereum accensum manibus teneat usque in finem, præterquam dum confirmatur.**

521. The word "**Neophytus**" is here for the first time applied by the rubrics to the newly baptized. Hitherto he has been called "**Catechumenus**", or "**Electus**"; but being now planted in Christ by baptism, he is said to be "**Neophytus**", which from its etymology (*νεόφυτος*), signifies "newly-planted". He is to hold the lighted candle in his hands until the conclusion of the ceremony, unless when he is receiving confirmation, if there be a bishop present to confer it.[2]

§ XLII.—**In Ecclesiis autem ubi Baptismus fit per mersionem, sive totius corporis, sive capitis tantum, Sacerdos accipiat Electum per brachia prope humeros, et superiore parte corporis nudatum, reliqua honeste contectum, ter illum, vel caput ejus mergendo, et toties elevando, baptizet sub trina mersione, sanctam Trinitatem semel tantum sic invocando:** *Ego te baptizo in Nomine Patris* ✠, **mergat semel:** *et Filii* ✠, **mergat iterum:** *et Spiritus Sancti* ✠, **mergat tertio: Patrino, vel Matrina, vel utroque eum tenente, vel tangente.**

522. We had occasion to say something of baptism by immersion in a preceding chapter.[3] There is much more difficulty in performing the ceremony for adults

[1] Supra, n. **354** et seq.
[2] Baruff., n. **82–83.**
[3] Chap. iv. § xviii.

than for infants, as is plain from the present rubric. Hence St. Charles permitted adults to be baptized by effusion, even in Milan, when the Ambrosian rite requiring immersion could not conveniently be carried out.[1] The words of his instruction on the subject are inserted as a rubric in the edition of the Ambrosian Ritual by Cardinal Cæsare Monte, "Baptizetur per immersionem ut ritus "Ambrosianæ Ecclesiæ postulat siquidem commode fieri "possit: alioquin per infusionem".[2]

From the last words of our rubric it appears that the sponsors are required to hold or touch the adult while he is being immersed, though this is not required when infants are baptized by immersion.[3]

§ XLIII.—**Et cum Electus surrexerit de Fonte, Patrinus vel Matrina cum linteo in manibus suscipit eum de manu Sacerdotis, et Sacerdos, intincto pollice dextero in sacro Chrismate, illum in vertice in modum Crucis perungit, dicens:** *Deus Omnipotens, etc.*

Deinde Sacerdos imponit capiti ejus linteolum, seu Chrismale, et dat ei vestem candidam, dicens: *Accipe vestem, etc.*

523. On coming out of the font the neophyte is received from the priest by the sponsor, holding in his hands a linen cloth, which he immediately wraps around him. The priest then applies the vertical unction, and presents the linen garment.

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. Instruct. Bapt. *De Baptismo Adultorum*, pag. 419. Cfr. Baruff., l. c. n. 85. Catal., tit. ii. cap. iv. § lvi. n. ii.

[2] Apud. Martene, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii. ord. xxi. *De Bapt. Adult.*

[3] Vid. supra, n. 347.

§ XLIV.—**Et statim prædicto linteo abstergitur, et in loco semoto vestitur novis et albis vestibus, et exteriore candida, quam accepit.**

524. This rubric shows that the neophyte is expected to put on white garments which he had not worn before, as well as the exterior one which is presented to him by the priest.[1] But the rubric of the Pontifical has the words: "**vel saltem exteriore candida**", instead of "**et exteriore candida**", and would seem, therefore, in strictness, to require no more than that the neophyte put on the exterior white garment presented to him by the priest.

XLV.—**Postea dat ei Sacerdos candelam accensam in manu dextera, dicens:** *Accipe lampadem, etc.*
Eodem modo, si plures fuerint, fit pro singulis.
Postea dicat: N. *Vade in pace, etc.*

525. When two or more are to be baptized, the whole of this ceremony, commencing with the interrogations on the Creed, is performed for each separately But it is not necessary that it be performed uninterruptedly. He first baptizes all, then applies the vertical unction to all, and having removed the chrism from his thumb, performs the rest of the ceremony.[2]

XLVI.—**Si adsit Episcopus qui id legitime præstare possit, ab eo Neophyti Sacramento Confirmationis initiantur. Deinde si hora congruens fuerit, celebratur Missa, cui Neophyti intersunt, et Sanctissimam Eucharistiam devote suscipiunt.**

526. If the preceding ceremony has been performed by

[1] Baruff., n. 87.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 376 et seq.

the bishop, or if the bishop be present after it has been performed by a priest, he should forthwith confer on the neophyte the sacrament of confirmation. Every bishop can lawfully do so in his own diocese, but not in a strange diocese without the permission of the Ordinary, and hence the words of the rubric, "**qui id legitime præstare possit**".[1]

Then, if the hour be suitable, mass ought to be celebrated, at which the neophytes should assist, and receive the Holy Communion. We have seen that, according to the ancient usage, even infants immediately after baptism were confirmed and received the Holy Eucharist,[2] and though this usage has been abolished with regard to infants, the rubrics here show that the Church wishes it to be continued when adults are baptized.

§ XLVII.—**Si vero ob baptizandorum multitudinem, ut in India et Novo Orbe quandoque contingit, in singulorum Baptismo præscripti ritus adhiberi non possunt, tunc vel pluribus simul adhibeantur, vel, si urget necessitas, omittantur.**

527. This provides for the case in which time would not permit the observance of all the preceding ceremonies, on account of the great number to be baptized. We have seen from the preceding rubrics, that many of the prayers and exorcisms may be said for a number of catechumens together; but this rubric permits even those that are prescribed for each, to be applied in case of necessity

[1] Cfr. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 171. Concil. Trid., Sess. vi. cap. v. *De Reform.*

[2] Vid. supra, n. 411 et seq.

to all in common; and if the necessity be very pressing, it even permits the entire omission of all, except what is essential to the sacrament, that is, except the application of the matter and form. It can rarely happen that these cannot be applied to each in particular, no matter how great the number or how pressing the necessity; but yet, in case of *extreme* necessity, as *e.g.*, in case of an earthquake or an inundation, it would be lawful to apply the matter and form to a number together, sprinkling them with water, and pronouncing the words in the plural: "*Ego vos baptizo, in nomine*", etc. This is clearly enough laid down in a preceding rubric, which in reference to this form "*Ego vos*", etc., after, permitting it in a certain case says: "**Quam tamen formam in iis solum, et in "aliis similibus mortis periculis ad plures simul bapti- "zandos, et ubi tempus non patitur ut singuli separatim "baptizentur, alias nunquam, licet adhibere**".[1]

[1] Supra, chap. iii. § xxiii.

CHAPTER VII.

ORDER FOR SUPPLYING THE CEREMONIES OMITTED IN BAPTISM.

ORDO SUPPLENDI OMISSA SUPER BAPTIZATUM.

§ I.—Cum, urgente mortis periculo, vel alia cogente necessitate, sive parvulus, sive adultus, sacris precibus ac cæremoniis prætermissis, fuerit baptizatus; ubi convaluerit, vel cessaverit periculum, et ad Ecclesiam delatus fuerit, omissa omnia supplentur.

528. It is never lawful, unless in case of necessity, to separate the ceremonies used in baptism from the application of the matter and form;[1] and if they be separated, the ceremonies omitted are to be afterwards supplied in the church, when the infant or adult, as the case may be, can be presented there for the purpose. This obligation of supplying the ceremonies is "*sub mortali*", according to St. Liguori;[2] but there may be very often sufficient reason for dispensing with it in the case of adults, the matter being left to the discretion of the bishop.[3]

§ II.—Idemque ordo ac ritus servetur, qui in Baptismo Parvulorum (si fuerit parvulus), seu Adultorum (si fuerit adultus) præscriptus est. Excepto quod interrogatio: An velit baptizari, formaque Baptismi, et ablutio præter-

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 141.
[2] Loc. cit. n. 144 *in parenth.*
[3] Vid. supra, chap. v. § xiii.

mittuntur, et quædam Orationes, et Exorcismi, suo quique loco immutati, ut infra, dicuntur.

529. The "Propaganda" edition of the ritual gives the "Ordo supplendi omissa" for infants, and also for adults, at full length. But many editions, including nearly all the older ones, as *e.g.* those used by Catalani and Baruffaldi, give only some of the prayers, noting for the rest, in general terms, the changes to be made, as is done in the present rubric.

Whether all the ceremonies are to be supplied, or only those that precede the application of the matter and form,[1] the priest goes vested in surplice and violet stole, and attended by his clerk, to the door of the church, where the sponsors with the infant or adult should be in waiting, and proceeds with the interrogations and the rest, exactly as if he were about to confer the sacrament, with the exceptions noted in the present rubric.

530. Instead of this rubric, the "Propaganda" edition has the following in the "Ordo supplendi", etc., for infants: "**Sacerdos itaque, lotis manibus, superpelliceo et "stola violacea indutus, accedat: Clericum unum, seu "plures, si potest, secum adhibeat, superpelliceo pariter "indutos, qui sibi ministrent.**

"**Ita paratus accedat ad limen Ecclesiæ, extra quam "expectant qui infantem, vel infantes detulerunt, illum pro-"prio nomine eidem impositio appellando et dicens: N.** *Quid "petis, etc.* **Patrinus Catechesis respondet:** *Fidem, etc.*"

It is remarkable that the sponsor is not here called simply "Patrinus", but "Patrinus Catechesis", as if to convey that, in the present case, he does not contract all the obligations of the sponsor.[2] The edition of the ritual

[1] Vid. supra, n. 382.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 402 et seq.

for the English clergy gives, like the "Propaganda" edition, the "Ordo supplendi omissa" for infants at full length, with all the necessary changes, and this is very convenient for priests, who may be often required to supply the ceremonies in this way.

§ III.—**Sacerdos igitur antequam immittat sal in os baptizati, manum super caput ejus imponens, dicat:** *Oremus. Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, etc.*

531. If the "Ordo supplendi", etc., be not given *in extenso*, at least the prayers that are changed are given, and the priest must turn over to read them at the proper time, instead of those given in the usual "Ordo Baptismi". By comparing them, it may be seen that the changes are very few, being only such as are necessary to make the prayers refer to baptism *already received*. In this prayer "*Omnipotens*", etc., the word "*dudum*" is inserted before "*ad rudimenta fidei*"; and there is added at the end the entire clause: "*ut idoneus* (**vel** *idonea*) *sit frui gratia Baptismi tui, quem suscepit, salis percepta medicina*".

§ IV.—**Deinde postequam modicum salis immisit in os baptizati, dicens:** *Accipe sal, etc.*, **dicit:** *Oremus. Deus Patrum nostrorum, etc.*

532. This rubric, as it lies in most editions of the Roman ritual, might be understood to direct that the prayer "*Deus Patrum nostrorum*", etc., should be said immediately after "*Accipe sal*", etc., as if the "*Pax tibi*", etc., were to be omitted. This would be a mistake, for it is here supposed (and indeed expressly ordered in the rubric above "**Idemque ordo ac ritus**", etc., given in

those editions), that every thing be done and said as if the sacrament were to be conferred, simply substituting the prayers given here for the corresponding prayers in the ordinary ceremony. In this prayer "*Deus Patrum*", etc., the words: "*et quem* (vel *quam*) *ad novæ regenerationis* "*lavacrum perduxisti*", are substituted for "*Perduc eum* "*ad novæ regenerationis lavacrum*".

§ V.—**Post hæc, facto signo Crucis in fronte baptizati, dictisque illis verbis:** *Et hoc signum Crucis* ✠, *etc.* . . **Manu super caput ejus imposita, dicit:** *Oremus. Æternam ac justissimam, etc.*

533. The words "**Post hæc**" do not mean immediately after the prayer "*Deus Patrum nostrorum*", etc., but after the exorcism which follows it, and of which the words "*Et hoc signum*", etc., are the conclusion. In this prayer "*Æternam ac justissimam*", etc., we have the words "*ut dignus* (vel *digna*) *sit frui gratia Baptismi tui*, "*quem suscepit*", for "*ut dignus gratia Baptismi tui* "*effectus*"; and we have the last clause entirely added, "*ut aptus* (vel *apta*) *sit ad retinendam gratiam Baptismi* "*tui*". These are the only changes made in supplying the ceremonies for infants. After the unction with oil of catechumens, the priest lays aside the violet, and puts on a white stole as usual, for the remaining ceremonies; but if these have been already applied, we think it is unnecessary for him to change his stole for the interrogations on the Creed, by which, in this case, the rite is concluded.

§ VI.—**In Baptismo autem adultorum, præter illa quæ supra notata sunt, quando supplentur omissa, hæc mutari**

debent. Primum in Exorcismo, *Audi maledicte Satana,* **ubi dicitur** (*habitaculum perficiat*) **dicatur,** *habitaculum perfecit:* **Deinde in Exorcismo,** *Nec te latet, etc.,* **ubi dicitur** (*ut fiat*), **dicatur,** *ut fieret.*

534. On this rubric we shall merely observe that the ceremonies of adult baptism are very rarely supplied. If one has been baptized in infancy, and has been educated as a Catholic, the ceremonies to be supplied, even when he is an adult, are those assigned in the ritual for infants, as was decided by the Sacred Congregation.[1] Adult converts are usually baptized, on being received into the Church, with the ceremonies prescribed in the "Order for Adults". If the baptism be conferred conditionally, the ceremonies are often dispensed with; but if performed at all, are still the same, except that the form is made conditional.[2]

The case then can hardly occur unless when it is *certain* that an adult convert was baptized validly before his conversion; or was baptized on account of some urgent necessity, without the ceremonies, at the time when he was received into the Church. In such circumstances, the ceremonies, unless the bishop thinks it expedient to omit them altogether, are to be supplied according to the form given for adults; and the priest who officiates must carefully note the changes to be made according to the present rubric. The "Propaganda" edition gives the "Ordo supplendi omissa super Baptizatum adultum" at full length, and the use of a ritual which gives this "Ordo" would save a great deal of trouble, and prevent the danger of mistakes.

[1] 27 Aug., 1836, *in Rhedonen,* ad 3^m^ n. 4780.
[2] Sac. Cong. Rit., *Decr. cit.* ad 4^m^

CHAPTER VIII.

RITE TO BE OBSERVED WHEN A BISHOP BAPTIZES.

RITUS SERVANDUS CUM EPISCOPUS BAPTIZAT.

§ I.—**Si Episcopus, vel S. R. E. Cardinalis parvulos vel adultos baptizare voluerit, parantur et servantur omnia, ut superius de Ordine Baptismi dictum est, atque hæc præterea quæ infra notantur.**

535. It is recommended in a previous rubric[1] that the baptism of adults in every diocese be left to the bishop, if he be pleased to confer it. At least, when he officiates on Holy Saturday, there should be some adults or infants to be baptized by him after the benediction of the font.[2] But at whatever time he may administer solemn baptism, everything should be prepared for the ceremony in the manner already prescribed by the ritual, both at the door of the church and at the font.[3] The whole rite is performed in the same way, as when a priest is the minister, with the exceptions noted in the following rubrics.

§ II.—**Adsint Capellani, vel alii Presbyteri, et Clerici Superpelliceis induti; qui ei assistant ac ministrent.**

536. If the ceremony be performed after the benedic-

[1] Chap. v. § iii.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 237.
[3] Supra, chap. iii. § xlii. et seq.

tion of the font on Holy Saturday or Pentecost Eve, the bishop is, of course, attended by the ministers of the mass and by his assistant deacons, as is directed by the "Cere-"moniale Episcoporum".[1] At other times he should be attended by at least two priests vested in surplice, who put on and take off the mitre at the proper time, point out the place in the ritual or pontifical, hold the bugia, etc., etc., and not less than four clerics, who are required to act as ministers, respectively, *de libro*, *de bugia*, *de mitra*, and *de baculo*. They should be vested in surplice, the two last wearing also light humeral veils, or using the sleeves of the surplice to cover their hands in holding the mitre and crozier.[2]

§ III.—**Ipse vero super rochetum, sive superpelliceum, si est Regularis, accipiat amictum album, et cingulum, et stolam, et pluviale violacei coloris, ac mitram.**

537. The bishop may, if he pleases, perform the ceremony as a simple priest, putting on a stole over his rochet, and wearing his cap instead of the mitre;[3] but here we suppose him to perform it pontifically, and in this case he should vest as the rubric directs. He may take the vestments wherever he pleases, or wherever it is found most convenient,—in the sacristy, at the high altar, in the baptistery, or some side chapel: "**in secretario vel "alibi, ad ejus libitum**", according to the rubric of the Pontifical.[4]

[1] Lib. ii. cap. xxvii. n. 16.
[2] Cæremoniale Episcoporum, lib. i. cap. xi. n. 5 et 6.
[3] Rit. Toul., *Baptême*, tit. IV^me^
[4] *Pro Baptismo Parvulorum.*

No mention is made of the amict in many editions of the ritual. It is expressly mentioned in our rubric, which is taken from the "Propaganda" edition; but even if it were not, there could be little doubt that it should be put on before the alb, as it is at vespers and high mass. There is no mention of the crozier in the rubric of the ritual, but it is mentioned in the rubric of the Pontifical, according to which the bishop uses it in the procession to the door of the church.

§ IV.—**Atque ita paratus cum Ministris procedat ad Baptismi ministerium. Et dum interrogat: N.** *Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei?* **ac dum facit reliquas interrogationes, sedet cum mitra: cum vero exsufflat, dicendo:** *Exi ab eo, immunde spiritus*, **surgit cum mitra. Rursus sedet, cum signat Catechumenum signo Crucis in fronte, et in pectore, vel dicit:** *Accipe signum Crucis, etc.* **Et cum dicit Orationes quæ præcedunt vel sequuntur benedictionem salis, surgit deposita mitra, similiter cum ipsum sal benedicit. Cum autem sal benedictum immittit in os baptizandi, mitram accipit, et sedet. Cum vero legit Exorcismos, et dum saliva aures et nares Catechumeni tangens dicit:** *Ephpheta*, **ac dum introducit eum in Ecclesiam, stat cum mitra. Cum autem dicit:** *Credo in Deum Patrem, etc.* **et** *Pater noster* **super Catechumenum, stat sine mitra. Sed cum nomen quærit, et interrogat: N.** *Abrenuntias Satanæ? etc.*, **et baptizandum Oleo sacro in pectore et inter scapulas inungit, sedet cum mitra: quo facto, accipit stolam et pluviale album. Et cum rursus interrogat de Fide:** *Credis in Deum Patrem. . . ? etc. Vis baptizari, etc.*, **et cum baptizat per infusionem, sedet cum mitra. Si vero baptizat per immersionem, mitram retinens stare debet.**

Cum demum Chrismate verticem baptizati linit, et dat ei vestem candidam, et candelam accensam, ac dicit: *Vade in pace, etc.*, **sedet cum mitra.**

538. The whole ceremony is given at length in the recent editions of the Pontificale Romanum, with the rubrics in their proper place, containing minute instructions on everything the bishop is required to do. It would save much trouble, therefore, to have a Pontifical in readiness, and to use it instead of the ritual. But, for the convenience of those who might be required to assist the bishop, and who might not have a Pontifical at hand, we think it well to note the following, taken partly from the Pontifical, and partly from what is observed in analogous functions, according to the Ceremoniale Episcoporum.

539. A faldstool with a violet cover should be placed on a piece of carpet at the door, and be afterwards removed and placed at the entrance of the baptistery, when the bishop and sponsors enter the church. It may be removed by a clerk when the bishop rises to recite the prayer "*Deus Patrum nostrorum*", etc.

When the bishop lays aside the violet, and puts on white vestments, it would be well to change also the cover of the faldstool; and it would be convenient, therefore, to have a white cover under the violet one from the commencement.

540. The Pontifical or ritual, with the bugia, should be in readiness on a small table or credence near the door.

The bishop uses the simple or plain mitre, with the violet vestments, and puts on the cloth of gold mitre (*mitram auriphrygiatam*), with the white vestments, and continues to wear it until the end. It would seem that the precious mitre is not used at baptism, as the Pontifical makes no mention of it. These different

mitres and their use, are treated of in the Ceremoniale Episcoporum.[1]

541. The bishop having vested, is accompanied by the clerks and chaplains to the door or porch. Arrived there, he lays aside the crozier, and takes his seat on the faldstool, where, with the mitre on, he proceeds with the interrogations "N. *Quid petis*", etc., the clerk "de libro", kneeling and holding the book, while one of the chaplains holds the bugia, etc. We may as well insert here the rubric of the Pontifical at the commencement of the ceremony, as it gives very minute instructions: "**Pontifex "infantem, vel infantes, sive pueros, sacri Baptismatis "unda immergere, seu perfundere volens, solitis indumentis "in Secretario, vel alibi ad ejus libitum, pluvialique viola- "cei coloris, et mitra simplici paratus, et baculo Pasto- "rali accepto, Capellanis vel aliis Presbyteris, et Clericis, "superpelliceis indutis, qui ei assistant ac ministrent, præ- "cedentibus, ad Ecclesiæ portam, extra quam expectant, "qui infantem vel infantes baptizandos detulerunt, procedit; "ibique, deposito baculo, sedet cum mitra in faldistorio, "ad ejusdem portæ limen, cum strato et violacea veste "præparato, Sicque sedens cum mitra, interrogat infantem "positum super brachium dextrum filius, qui eum defert, "filium nomine proprio, eidem imposito, appellando, et "dicens: (Si plures fuerint baptizandi dicat singulariter "singulis). N. *Quid petis*", *etc.***

This rubric of the Pontifical seems to imply that the bishop should be preceded by his chaplains as well as by the clerks in the procession to the door of the church. But from the general instructions of the Ceremoniale Episcoporum, regarding the attendance of a bishop when vested in cope, we are inclined to think that two

[1] Lib. i. cap. xvii.

chaplains may accompany him, one on each side, raising the borders of the cope, while during the ceremony there is no doubt that one of them standing on the bishop's right should raise the border of the cope whenever he makes the sign of the cross.[1]

542. The bishop is seated or standing, and the mitre is taken off and put on, as is directed in the above rubric of the ritual. If the ritual be used, it would be convenient to note in the margin what is to be done in the several parts. It may be observed that the bishop wears the mitre not only at those parts at which the priest may wear his cap, according to the directions of the ritual of Toulon, which we have given in the notes to the rubrics of the "Ordo Baptismi";[2] but also at the unction with the oil of catechumens, and the rest of the ceremonies to the end, during which the priest should be uncovered.

The words of the rubric, "**similiter dum ipsum sal benedicit**", seem to imply that he does not wear the mitre at any part of the "*Benedictio salis*", but, in the Pontifical, he is directed to wear the mitre until the words "*ad effugandum inimicum*", after which he lays it aside, and then proceeds "*Proinde te rogamus*", etc., till the end. To reconcile this apparent opposition between the Ritual and the Pontifical, it has occurred to us, that perhaps the first part, "*Exorcizo te creatura salis*", is to be regarded as an exorcism, and that the benediction, properly speaking, commences with the words, "*Proinde te rogamus*", etc., for in this interpretation he should, even according to the

[1] Vid. Ceremoniale Episcoporum, lib. i. cap. viii. n. 2–3.

[2] Chap. iv. et chap. vi.

ritual, wear the mitre during the first part as being an exorcism.

§ V.—**Si autem Pontifex quempiam a Presbytero jam catechizatum, tantum baptizare voluerit, sic paratus vestibus albis incipiat, postquam ad Baptisterium deventum fuerit, dicens:** *Quo nomine vocaris?* ℣. **N. Episcopus interrogat: N.** *Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem. . . . ? etc.*, **et prosequitur usque in finem juxta ordinem Baptismi, ut supra.**

543. The bishop may, if he pleases, merely confer the sacrament, and apply the ceremonies which follow, those which precede having been, immediately before, performed by a priest. This arrangement is not unfrequently adopted on Holy Saturday. It is followed in Rome on that day, according to the author of the "*Cérémonial Des Evéques Expliqué*".[1] In this case, the bishop puts on white vestments at the commencement, and goes at once to the baptistery. He begins by the interrogations on the Creed, having first put the question, "*Quo nomine vocaris?*" as here directed, and then proceeds as in the "Ordo".

The same privilege, however, is not allowed to a simple priest. If he confers baptism, he must also himself perform the ceremonies that precede, as was decided by the Sacred Congregation.[2]

[1] Lib. ii. chap. xxvii. 18. note.

[2] 19 Decr. 1665, *in Florentin*, n. 2350.

CHAPTER IX.

BLESSING OF THE BAPTISMAL FONT WHEN THERE IS NO CONSECRATED WATER, AT ANY TIME EXCEPT THE SATURDAYS OF EASTER AND PENTECOST.

BENEDICTIO FONTIS BAPTISMI EXTRA SABBATUM PASCHÆ ET PENTECOSTES, CUM AQUA CONSECRATA NON HABETUR.

544. We have seen before that the water used in the solemn administration of baptism, should be blessed on Holy Saturday or the Eve of Pentecost, according to the form given in the missal, and that to keep up the supply, unblessed water may be occasionally added to what is contained in the font.[1] But when the font is exhausted or what it contains becomes unfit for use, a new supply must be blessed according to the form here given in the ritual.

§ I.—**Primum lavatur et mundatur Vas Baptisterii, deinde limpida aqua repletur.**

545. In the first place, the font must be thoroughly cleansed, the sediment being carefully removed and thrown into the sacrarium, according to the instructions

[1] Supra, n. 158 et seq.

of St. Charles,[1] and then a supply of pure clear water poured in. The rubrics plainly suppose that the ceremony takes place in the baptistery, within, or adjoining, the church.[2] The words "**Vas Baptisterii**", here, and in the next rubric "**Altare Baptisterii**", and the very title of the present chapter, evidently imply this. Nevertheless, in dioceses or districts, where there are no baptismal fonts, and where, on account of peculiar circumstances, baptism is conferred with all the ceremonies in private houses, the water used should still be blessed according to the form here prescribed, unless there be permission to use an abbreviated form.[3]

But, in any case, when water is to be blessed for baptism, whether in the regular font, or in a vessel temporarily used for the purpose, care should be taken to carry out what the present rubric directs, as regards the condition of the vessel and the quality of the water.

§ II.—**Tum Sacerdos cum suis Clericis, vel etiam aliis Presbyteris, Cruce et duobus cereis præcedentibus, ac thuribulo et incenso, et cum vasculis Chrismatis et Olei Catechumenorum descendit ad Fontem, et ibi vel ante Altare Baptisterii dicit Litaniam ordinariam, prout habetur infra post septem Psalmos Pœnitentiales. Et ante ℣. *Ut nos exaudire digneris*, dicat, et secundo repetat sequentem ℣. *Ut Fontem istum, etc.***

546. The rubric here says nothing of the vestments to be worn, but there can be little doubt that the priest who is to bless the font should be vested in a stole, and

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. *De Baptismi administratione*, p. 410.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 239.

[3] Vid. supra, n. 384 et seq. n 390 et seq.

if possible, also a cope of violet over his surplice. These are the vestments expressly assigned to him by Catalani[1] and De Herdt.[2] He wears the same, having an alb instead of the surplice, on Holy Saturday.[3] But, at least, he must have on a surplice and stole, according to the general rubric for benedictions given hereafter in the ritual. The priests, if any, who assist him, and the clerks are vested in surplice.

547. The procession from the vestry to the font is formed as follows: first—the thurifer with thurible and incense; next the cross-bearer between two acolytes with lighted candles; and lastly the officiating priest between two assistants (clerks, if there be no priests to act as such), who raise the borders of his cope. If there be others in surplice, they walk, two and two, immediately after the cross-bearer. This is the order of the procession to the font on Holy Saturday, except that the Paschal candle is carried instead of the thurible, and that the celebrant is attended by the deacon on his right, and the sub-deacon on his left.[4]

For the proper performance of the function, there should be at least six clerks,—viz., a thurifer, cross-bearer, two acolytes, and two assistants. Four would suffice for the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday in minor churches, according to what is prescribed in the "Memoriale Rituum".[5] But on Holy Saturday, the thurible is not used, and the acolytes can be dispensed with, as one of the clerics carries the Paschal candle. If, in the case

[1] Tit. ii. cap. vii. § i. n. iii.
[2] Part. iv. n. 3 iv. in fine.
[3] Merati, para. iv. tit. x. n. xxxv.
[4] Merati, loc. cit.
[5] Tit. vi. cap. ii. sec. 4.

supposed by our rubric, the priest has only four clerks, either he must dispense with the assistants (and in this, case it would perhaps be better that he should not wear the cope),[1] or he should have two lighted candles placed at the font, so that the cross-bearer could stand between them.

547. The rubric seems to direct that the holy oils be carried by some one in the procession. This should be done if there be any one in holy orders to carry them,[2] otherwise they should be in readiness on a table or credence covered with a white cloth and placed near the font.[3]

Arrived at the baptistery, the cross-bearer takes his position near the font, so as to be opposite the priest during the benediction, and stands there with the acolytes till the end of the ceremony; but the exact arrangement depends so much on the place in which the font is constructed, that it must be left in each case to be determined by the master of ceremonies.[4] The officiating priest and all the rest, except the cross-bearer and acolytes, kneel facing the altar of the baptistery, if it have one, or facing the high altar.[5]

Then the priest recites the Litany of the Saints, the rest answering, and before the "*Ut nos exaudire digneris*", he rises up, and turning to the font, says twice, "*Ut fon-*" "*tem istum*", etc., making each time the sign of the cross with his right hand over the font, at the words marked in

[1] Vid. supra, n. 473. [2] Rit. Toul., tit. v. n. 1.

[3] Rit. Toul. ibid. Memoriale Rituum, tit. vi. cap. i. *De præparandis in Baptisterio si adsit.*

[4] Cfr. Merati, l. c. n. xxxvi. [5] Rit. Toul. l. c.

the ritual. After which he kneels again, until "*Dominus* "*vobiscum*", when he rises and recites the prayer "*Omni-* "*potens sempiterne*", etc., at the end of which all rise.[1]

§ III.—**Potest etiam dici Litania brevior, ut in Missali in Sabbato Sancto.**

548. The priest may recite, as he pleases, either the ordinary litany given in the ritual after the Seven Penitential Psalms, or that which is given in the missal for Holy Saturday. If he selects the latter, it may be asked, should not what he says be repeated in the responses; or in other words should not the litany be doubled, as is the case on Holy Saturday.[2] We should say not, for, in this supposition, the litany of the missal could not well be called, as it is here, "**brevior**", since it would take a much longer time to recite it. It is even inserted in some editions of the ritual, as *e g.*, that for the use of the English clergy, with the responses in the ordinary way.

§ IV.—**Et dicto ultimo,** *Kyrie eleison*, **Sacerdos dicat:** *Pater noster*, **et** *Credo in Deum, etc.*, **omnia clara voce: quibus finitis, dicat:** ℣. *Apud te, Domine, etc.*

549. In the ordinary litany, after the last "*Kyrie*", the Pater Noster is said "**secreto**", according to the rubric, and then the psalm "*Deus in adjutorium*", etc. Here it is directed that the Pater Noster and the Creed be recited "**clara voce**", after which the priest is to say the versicles, prayers, and exorcism marked in the ritual.

[1] Rit. Toul. tit. v. n. 1 et 2.

[2] Rub. Miss. in loc. Mem. Rituum, tit. vi. cap. ii. sec. vi. n. 5.

Rising from his knees, he says "*Dominus vobiscum*" with the prayer which follows, and then taking his place at the font, if he be not in it already, proceeds with the exorcism, which he says with his hands joined, making the sign of the cross over the water at the words marked in the ritual, which is held before him by one of the clerks.[1]

§ V.—**Hic manu aquam dividat, et deinde de ea effundat extra marginem Fontis versus quatuor Orbis partes, prosequens.** *Et in quatuor fluminibus, etc.*

550. If the place of the font admits of such an arrangement, the priest, according to some, should stand during the exorcism and the rest of the ceremony, with his face to the west, or the door of the church, the cross-bearer being on the other side of the font opposite him. This is the position assigned to him by Bauldry[2] and Merati.[3] But De Herdt[4] says he should have his face to the east, and this we think the more convenient position, because he is thus turned towards the high altar, as he is required to be in reciting the litany when there is no altar in the baptistery, and also because in this position he can more easily perform the ceremony which is prescribed in the present rubric.

551. He first divides the water, and this with his *hand*, as Baruffaldi here observes,[5] and not merely with his fingers. He does so by making the sign of the cross,

[1] Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 2.
[2] Pars. iv. cap. xi. *De Sabbato Sancto*, art. 4. n. iii.
[3] Pars. iv. tit. x. n. xxxviii.
[4] Pars. v. n. 16. vi.
[5] Tit. xvi. n. 16.

(for the division should be made in form of a cross),[1] with his hand immersed in the water to the wrist, or at least as far as the thumb. Then with his hand he throws out a little, or causes a little to overflow the margin towards the four cardinal points, in the following order, as is expressly directed in the "Memorale Rituum".[2] 1° Towards the east; 2° Towards the west; 3° Towards the north; 4° Towards the south, thus:

1 E.

3 N. 4 S.

2 W.

Now this arrangement of the numbers which is given in the "Memoriale Rituum", appears to suggest that the priest should stand facing the east, otherwise he should pour out the water first towards himself; secondly, opposite himself; thirdly, on his right hand; and lastly, on his left, which would be against the usual order in such circumstances.

This ceremony signifies, according to Baruffaldi,[3] the universality of baptism and its diffusion throughout the world.

Having dried his hand with a towel, which should be presented to him by one of the clerics,[4] he continues: "*Et* "*in quatuor fluminibus*", etc.

§ VI.—**Tunc sufflet ter in aquam versus tres partes secundum hanc figuram Ψ: deinde imponit incensum in thuribulo, et Fontem incensat.**

552. There is some diversity of opinion as to the

[1] Baruff., n. 18.
[2] Tit. vi. cap. ii. sec. iv. n.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Rit. Toul. tit. v. n. 8.

manner in which the insufflation should here be made, or as to the figure which should be described by it; and this diversity arises, in part at least, from the different forms found in different editions of the ritual and missal. In some we have Y, in others Ψ, in others T, in others ✠.[1] The "Memoriale Rituum" says: "Ter sufflat in formam "Tridentalem juxta figuram in missali".[2] Now this expression, we think, implies that it is not made simply in the form of a cross, as Catalani maintains,[3] otherwise it would say "in modum Crucis", but in some one of the other figures given above, most probably Ψ, because this is the form given in the most approved editions of the missal and ritual. It is made, according to the ritual of Toulon,[4] by describing first the centre line, then the line towards the right, and lastly the line towards the left.

After the insufflation, he puts incense into the thurible, and, according to the ritual of Toulon,[5] blesses it with the usual form: "*Ab illo benedicaris in cujus honore cre-* "*maberis*". Baruffaldi also[6] supposes that the incense is blessed, and observes that the incensation here prescribed supplies the place of the immersion of the Paschal candle, which is part of the ceremony on Holy Saturday. He incenses the font with three swings,[7] in the same manner as the candles on the Feast of the Purification, or the ashes on Ash Wednesday, one towards the centre, one towards his left, and one towards his right, for the *right*

[1] Cfr. Baruff., n. 19 et seq. Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 4. Catal., tit. ii. cap. vii. § iv. n. i.

[2] *De Sab. Sanct.*, cap. ii. sec. iv. n. iii.

[3] Loc. cit. [4] Loc. cit. [5] Loc. cit.

[6] Loc. cit. n. 21. [7] Rit. Toul., l. c.

of any object in front of us is to our *left*, and its *left* to our *right*.[1]

§ VII.—**Postea infundens de Oleo Catechumenorum in aquam in modum Crucis, clara voce dicit:** *Sanctificetur, etc.*

Deinde infundit de Chrismate modo quo supra, dicens: *Infusio Chrismatis, etc.*

Postea accipit ambas ampullas dicti Olei sancti et Chrismatis, et de utroque simul in modum Crucis infundendo, dicit: *Commixtio Chrismatis, etc.*

553. He next pours in some of the oil of catechumens, making a cross on the water, three times with the stream as it issues from the vessel containing it, saying at the same time "*Sanctificetur et fœcundetur*", etc.

Then he pours in chrism in the same manner, *i.e.*, three times in the form of a cross,[2] saying "*Infusio Chrismatis*", etc.

Lastly, taking the two vessels (both together, if possible, in his right hand), he pours oil and chrism together, likewise thrice in form of a cross, saying "*Commixtio* "*Chrismatis*", etc.

554. These ceremonies are of very great antiquity, being prescribed wholly, or in part, in the most ancient missals and rituals extant. In some there is mention only of chrism, but in many others both oil and chrism are mentioned. There is some variety also in the prayers, but the same idea runs through all, as may be seen in the extracts from these books given by Martene.[3] "When

[1] Vid. Merati, pars. iv. tit. vi. n. x. et xi., et pars. ii. tit. vi. n. xxxii.

[2] Cfr. Merati, pars. iv. tit. x. n. xliii.

[3] *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xviii.

"baptism is administered with solemn ceremonies", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the Catholic "Church, guided by Apostolic tradition, has uniformly "observed the practice of adding (to the water) holy "chrism, by which, it is clear, the effect of baptism is "more fully declared".[1]

The whole ceremony, as here prescribed, or as it may have been formerly observed, is designed to signify, that the water is sanctified, and has imparted to it by the Holy Ghost the virtue of sanctifying and regenerating those who are baptized, according to the idea expressed by so many of the early Fathers. "Aquæ sanctificatæ vim "sanctificandi combibunt", says Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, cap. 4. "Quod est uterus embryoni, hoc est fideli aqua". St. Chrys. *Hom.* 25 *in Joan.* "Spiritûs efficacitate sensi- "bilis aqua in divinam quamdam et ineffabilem vim trans- "formatur, omnesque demum in quibus fuerit sanctificat". St. Cyr. Alex., lib. 2. *in Joan.*[2]

§ VIII.—**Tum, deposita ampulla, dextera manu Oleum sanctum et Chrisma infusum miscet cum aqua, et spargit per totum Fontem. Deinde medulla panis manum tergit; et si quis baptizandus est, cum baptizat, ut supra. Quod si neminem baptizat, statim manus abluat, et ablutio effundatur in Sacrarium.**

555. This rubric requires little or no explanation. There cannot be, properly speaking, a mixture of the oil and water, which refuse to unite; but the priest is directed to mingle them with his right hand, so as to make the oil and chrism be diffused, for the moment at least,

[1] Pars. ii. cap. ii. n. 11.

[2] Cit. apud. De Lahogue, *De Sacramentis in genere*, cap. iv. art. i.

through the water of the font, and not merely rest on its surface, the mystic signification of the ceremony being the union of the faithful, represented by the water, with Christ, represented by the oil and chrism, according to Durandus and Quarti.[1] A film will afterwards be formed on the surface, but this can be removed as has been stated before.[2]

556. The rubric clearly supposes that he has such a supply of the oil and chrism that they can be *poured into* the font.[3] But if he has not, the ritual published for the use of the English Church directs him in a parenthetic clause, to make the signs of the cross on the surface of the water with his thumb, or an instrument of silver, after having dipped it into the oilstocks. To apply the oil and chrism together in such a case, we think he might dip his thumb into one, and the index finger into the other, and with both united make the sign of the cross.

He then rubs his hand with crumbs of bread, or a little meal, and if there be any one to be baptized, does not wash them until he has conferred baptism. But if there be no one to be baptized, having rubbed his hands as directed, in order to remove the oil, he immediately washes them, and throws the water into the sacrarium.

The water, towel, and crumbs of bread, should have been placed, before the commencement of the ceremony, on a table near the font: and of course, if there be any one to be baptized, care should be taken to make the preparations prescribed by the rubrics in a preceding chapter.[4]

[1] Cit. apud Catalani, cap. vii. § vii. n. i.
[2] Supra, n. 163.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 265.
[4] Chap. iii. § xlii. et seq.

CHAPTER X.

THE BLESSING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILDBIRTH.

DE BENEDICTIONE MULIERIS POST PARTUM.

§ I.—Si qua puerpera post partum, juxta piam ac laudabilem consuetudinem, ad Ecclesiam venire voluerit pro incolumitate sua Deo gratias actura, petieritque a Sacerdote benedictionem, ipse superpelliceo et stola alba indutus, cum Ministro aspergillum deferente, ad fores Ecclesiæ accedat, ubi illam foris ad limina genuflectentem, et candelam accensam in manu tenentem Aqua benedicta aspergat, deinde dicat: *Adjutorium nostrum, etc.*

557. This ceremony of the blessing, or as it is sometimes called the churching, sometimes the purification, of women after child-birth, is of great antiquity in the Church. St. Gregory the Great, in one of his letters to St. Augustin, Apostle of England, refers to it in words, which are adopted in the text of the canon, *Dist.* 5. *Si mulier.*, and in which he declares that Christian women after child-birth are not prohibited under pain of sin from entering the church at any time, but are free to go without the least delay to give thanks to God. "Si "mulier eadem hora qua genuerit, actura gratias intrat "Ecclesiam, nullo peccati pondere gravatur".[1] Innocent

[1] Cit. apud Catal., tit. vii. cap. iii. n. ii.

III. declares the same, stating that the provisions of the Mosaic law, which fixed a time during which women after child-birth, were excluded from the temple, ceased under the Gospel; but he adds: "Si tamen ex venera-"tione voluerint aliquamdiu abstinere, devotionem earum "non credimus improbandam".[1]

558. The law of Leviticus[2] prohibited women after child-birth from entering the sanctuary, and from touching anything sacred, for forty days, if the child born were a male, or for eighty days, if it were a female. It is evident from the words of the law, that it could not apply to the Blessed Virgin, in whom there were none of the effects of ordinary child-birth, since not only in conceiving, but in giving birth to the divine Infant, she still remained a pure and perfect virgin.[3] Yet we know from St. Luke[4] that she did not avail herself of the exemption, but humbly complied with the requirements of the law. A desire of imitating this humility of the Blessed Virgin induced the custom amongst Christian mothers of abstaining from entering the church for some time after child-birth. They then asked the blessing of the priest at the church door, and made their first visit one of thanksgiving to God for their safe delivery.[5]

559. In the Greek Church, the custom is looked on as imposing a strict obligation: "Obedientiam illam", says

[1] Cap. i. lib. iii. *Decret.* tit. 47. *De purif. post partum.* cit. apud. Catal., ibid. [2] Chap. xii.

[3] Vid. Benedict XIV., *De Festis B. V. M.*, cap. ii. n. ii.

[4] Cap. ii. v. 22 et seq.

[5] Vid. Baruf., tit. xliii. n. 8. Catal., l. c. n. iii. Caval. vol. iv. cap. xlii.

Goar, "ex debito requirunt Græci".[1] But the canons above cited, and the words of our rubric, show clearly that in the Latin Church, the custom, although recommended as pious and laudable, does not bind under pain of sin. De Herdt[2] states that the third provincial council of Mechlin proposed to make this benediction a matter of precept, but the decree on the subject was changed by the authorities at Rome.

The pastor then should exhort women to receive the benediction, but must not insist on their receiving it, as if the omission would be a sin.

560. There is nothing in the rubric, nor in any general law of the Church, to exclude from this benediction women who have given birth to illegitimate children, but they are excluded by many diocesan and provincial statutes.[3] In some parts of Ireland they are excluded, in others they are, at least with certain restrictions, admitted. Amongst the statutes of Cashel and Emly, drawn up in 1782, we find the following: "Nulla mulier quæ "extra matrimonium pepererit ante mensem elapsum pu- "rificetur; si iterum et similiter pepererit ante duos menses "elapsos non purificetur; ter extra matrimonium pariens "nunquam purificetur".[4]

The Congregation of Rites having been consulted on the subject, decided that none but those whose children

[1] ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ, *etc.*, *In Orationem pro muliere puerpera post quadraginta dies Notæ*, n. i. pag. 328.

[2] Pars. vi. n. 11, iii.

[3] De Herdt, l. c. i. Vid. Melanges Theologiques, V^me^ serie, 3^me^ Cahier, pag. 375.

[4] Cap. ii. *De Baptismo*, Vid. *Collections on Irish Church History*, etc., Appendix C, p. 475.

are the fruit of lawful wedlock, can claim a right to this benediction.[1] The pastor, therefore, may refuse it in any case, in which the birth is notoriously illegitimate, even when there is no diocesan or provincial statute requiring him to do so.

561. The rubric clearly supposes that the ceremony is performed in the church, and, according to the discipline that generally prevails now, it should not be performed elsewhere. There is no doubt that in some places it was the custom to perform it in private houses, at least when asked for by those who were unable to go to the church. Martene gives an extract from the ancient Ritual of Chalons, which directs the priest what to do in such circumstances.[2] Catalani gives another from the "Sacerdotale Romanum", published at Venice in 1567, which likewise prescribes what the priest should do in the case.[3] The prevalence of the practice may be inferred also from the many decrees prohibiting it, which are cited by Catalani.[4] St. Charles, in the third Provincial Council of Milan, prohibits it: "etiamsi mulier ob adversam valetudinem ecclesiam adire nequeat".[5]

The custom prevailed in Ireland in the times of persecution, when there were no churches, and is still continued in some parts of the country. It appears to have prevailed in America also, for in the first Provincial

[1] 18 Jun., 1859, *in Wratislavien*, apud Falise, *Sac. Rit. Cong. Decr.*, V. Benedictio. § i. n. 18.

[2] *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. ix. art. v. ordo xi.

[3] Tit. vii. cap. iii. n. viii. [4] Loc. cit. n. ix. et x.

[5] *Act. Eccl. Mediolan.*, Conc. Prov. iii. § *Quæ ad Sacramentalia et Sacramenta generatim spectant*, pag. 74.

Council of Baltimore, the fathers express a desire, though they do not strictly order, that for the future the benediction be not given "extra Ecclesiam vel locum ubi "sacrum fit".[1]

The decree in its first form contained a strict precept, but this was changed by direction of the Sacred Congregation, into the expression of a wish. The reason assigned for the change, shows what prudent caution is necessary, as has been before stated,[2] in dealing with an old custom at variance with the rubric: " . . . nam valde periculosum "est", says the Sacred Congregation, "contrarium morem "generali lege repente mutare".[3]

In districts, then, where there are no churches, and where mass is celebrated in private houses, the benediction may be given to those who desire it; for, after all, the ritual, according to the instruction of the Sacred Congregation just cited, does not require that it be given in the church exclusively. Even where there is no want of churches, it may in special cases, at least with the sanction of the bishop, be given "extra Ecclesiam". This is the conclusion of the "Melanges Theologiques".[4]

562. But the ceremony, as we have seen, is not of obligation, and may be omitted without scruple.[5] It should therefore, at least as a general rule, either be performed in exact accordance with the rubric, or be omitted altogether.[6]

[1] Decr. xix. q. v. in Append. [2] Vid supra, n. 84 et seq.

[3] *Instructio circa Decr. a Syn. Prov. Balt.* In Decr. 19° Vid. Append.

[4] Loc. cit. pag. 379. [5] Supra, n. 559.

[6] Vid. Catal., l. c. n. x. Caval., vol. iv. cap. xiii. *De Benedictione Puerperarum*, in Decr. v. n. vi. De Herdt, l. c. vi.

563. There is nothing in the rubric to imply that the right of giving this benediction is reserved to the parish priest. The wording appears to leave the woman free to receive it in any church she may select. Hence it was commonly maintained that Religious might give it in their churches to any who presented themselves, and this view is supported by several decisions of the Congregation of the Council cited by Cavalieri.[1] But a decree of the Congregation of Rites,[2] and the latest decisions of the Congregation of the Council,[3] are in favour of the opinion more commonly held at present, which would reserve the right of giving the benediction to the parish priest. The "Melanges Theologiques"[4] regards these as decisive. So do De Herdt[5] and Falise.[6]

Cavalieri, however, contends that the decree of the Congregation of Rites applies only to the churches of certain confraternities, about which there was question in the case proposed;[7] and it is probable that the answers of the Congregation of the Council may be understood also as applying only in the cases proposed,[8] so that it is very doubtful whether there be any general law reserving this benediction to the parochial clergy, but there are many provincial and diocesan statutes reserving it.[9]

[1] Loc. cit. [2] 10 Decr. 1703, *Urbis et orbis*, ad 6. n. 3670.
[3] 31 Mar., 1759, et 26 April, 1788. cit. apud Melanges Theologiques, V^me^ Serie, pag. 386.
[4] Loc. cit. pag. 383 et seq. [5] Pars. vi. n. 11. v.
[6] III^me^ Partie. sect. ii. chap. i. § i. n. i. note.
[7] Loc. cit. in Decr. iv.
[8] Vid. Ferraris, Edit. Migne. *Supplementum.* Resolutiones Sac. Cong. Concilii, n. 340. *Celsonen.* vol. viii. pag. 1109. [9] Vid. De Herdt, l. c.

564. It is clear from what has been said above[1] that the benediction may be given at any time after childbirth that is found convenient. In the Greek Church it is given only after an interval of forty days.[2] But there is no obligation to wait for this, or for any other fixed time. It is even recommended *not* to do so, in order to avoid the appearance of conforming to the old Jewish law, as if it were still in force.[3]

In some places it is usual for women not to leave the house for about six weeks after childbirth, and this custom, where it prevails, is sufficient, according to the common opinion, to excuse them from the obligation of hearing Mass during that time.[4] But we have already seen[5] that they are free to go to the church as soon as they please; and though it is usual, and even advisable, to ask for the benediction the first time they go, they may put it off without scruple till another time which they may think more convenient.

565. Quarti, and others cited by Baruffaldi,[6] say that the mother, when about to receive the benediction, should bring her child with her and offer it to God, after the example of the Blessed Virgin, who offered the Divine Infant in the Temple on the day of her purification. This is the usage in the Greek Church. The Euchologium contains a prayer having special reference to the child, and directs this prayer to be omitted in case the child be dead, supposing thereby that this is

[1] Supra, n. 558. [2] Goar, loc. cit. note 2. p. 328.
[3] Baruff., tit. xliii. n. 10. De Herdt, loc. cit. i.
[4] St. Lig. lib. iv. n. 330 in fine. [5] Supra, n. 557.
[6] Loc. cit. n. 14.

the only case in which the child is not present with the mother.[1]

In the Latin Church, however, the usage, though recommended by some as pious and laudable, does not prevail. It is very easily seen that the ceremony, as we have it in the Roman Ritual, regards only the mother, and contains nothing to imply that the child should be present.[2]

566. The priest is directed by the rubric to vest for this ceremony in surplice and white stole. The stole should be white, because this is the colour used by the Church on the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, with which, as has been said,[3] the present ceremony is closely connected.[4]

He should be attended by a clerk vested in surplice,[5] who precedes him from the vestry to the door of the church, carrying the "**aspergillum**", or brush for sprinkling the holy water, which is supposed to be, as usual, in a stoup at the door.

567. The rubric requires that the woman be outside the door of the church, just at the threshold, "**foris ad limina**", as she thus acknowledges her unworthiness to enter until she receives the blessing of the priest and is introduced by him. Hence the ceremony should not be performed elsewhere, *e.g.*, in the sacristy, or at the door of the sacristy. This is an abuse strongly censured by Baruffaldi[6] and Cavalieri,[7] who say that the ceremony,

[1] Vid. Catal., tit. vii. cap. iii. n. xxiii. xxiii.
[2] Baruff., n. 15. Caval. l. c. De Herdt, l. c. iv.
[3] Supra, n. 558.
[4] Baruff., n. 22. De Herdt, loc. cit. vii.
[5] Vid, supra, n. 126.
[6] Tit. xliii. n. 23-24.
[7] Cap. xiii. *De Benedictione Puerperarum*, Decr. v. n. vi.

being free, should be performed as the rubric directs, or not at all. If there be a porch, she can remain within it, as she is still "**foris**". But if there be not, and if she cannot remain outside without danger to her health, she may be allowed to remain just within the door, according to De Herdt.[1]

The rubric prescribes that she be kneeling with a lighted candle in her hand, when the priest comes to the door.

568. Taking the "Aspergillum", which is presented by the clerk, he sprinkles her with holy water. This should be done in form of a cross, according to De Herdt[2] and Falise,[3] though the rubric does not explicitly prescribe this here as it does below. Cavalieri[4] and Baruffaldi[5] recommend him to say the usual words "*Asperges me Domine*", etc., though the rubric does not mention them.

Having returned the "Aspergillum" to the clerk, he says: "*Adjutorium nostrum*", etc. Falise[6] directs him, while saying these words, to make the sign of the cross on the woman, but we think it is more in accordance with usage and analogy to make it on himself.[7] He then says the antiphon and psalm, "*Domini est terra*", etc.

§ II.—**Deinde porrigens ad manum mulieris extremam partem stolæ, eam introducit in Ecclesiam, dicens:** *Ingredere, etc.*

569. The priest then presents to her the extremity of

[1] Par. vi. n. 11. vii. 2° Vid. supra, n. 289.
[2] Loc. cit. 5°. [3] *De la purif. des femmes*, etc., n. 2.
[4] Loc. cit. [5] Loc. cit. n. 28. [6] Loc. cit.
[7] Vid. infra, chap. xiv. § xvi.

the stole that hangs on his left, which she takes in her right hand;[1] then, rising up, she enters the church, walking on the left of the priest, when he says: "*Ingre-* "*dere*", etc.

The commentators do not say what she is to do at this time with the lighted candle. They are agreed that the reason why it is required at all is, because lighted candles are carried in the procession on the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, which the present ceremony commemorates. It would seem, therefore, that she should carry the candle while entering the church, and as she can no longer hold it in her right hand, she should have transferred it to her left before taking hold of the priest's stole.

§ III.—**Et ipsa ingressa genuflectit coram Altari, [et erat, gratias agens Deo de beneficiis sibi collatis; et Sacerdos dicit:** *Kyrie eleison, etc.*

570. The priest conducts her, in the manner explained,[2] to the altar, before which she is directed to kneel down and make her thanksgiving. This altar, according to Baruffaldi,[3] should be that of the Blessed Sacrament, or of the Blessed Virgin. One of these is usually selected, but it may be any other. Cavalieri[4] recommends the one nearest the door, as more conformable to the words of the rubric. The prayers she is to say are left to her own devotion. When she has knelt down, the priest, having made the proper reverence, ascends the

[1] Baruff., n. 30. Caval., l. c. n. vii. De Herdt, l. c. 6°.
[2] Caval., l. c. n. viii. [3] Loc. cit. n. 32.
[4] Loc. cit. in Decr. v.

predella, and turning towards her,[1] says the prayers prescribed, *Kyrie eleison*, etc.

§ IV.—**Deinde illam aspergit iterum Aqua benedicta in modum Crucis, dicens:** *Pax et benedictio, etc.*

571. Having finished the prayers, he takes the aspergillum presented to him by the clerk, and again sprinkles her with holy water. The rubric here directs that he do so in form of a cross, saying the words *Pax et benedictio*, etc. When water is sprinkled in form of a cross, it should be sprinkled first on the centre, then on the right, and lastly on the left of the person or object.[2]

The holy water should have been previously left on the credence, otherwise it should be carried by the clerk along with the "aspergillum" from the door.

572. We find nothing in the commentators about the time of extinguishing the candle. We believe the woman usually holds it lighted until the conclusion of the ceremony, having transferred it again to her right hand on kneeling down before the altar. She then presents it to the priest, who hands it to the clerk to be extinguished.

It is the custom in many places to present other offerings as well as the candle. The manner in which these are disposed of is regulated by the statutes or approved usages of the diocese.[3] In churches where there is no fund for altar requisites, the candles are usually set apart for the use of the altar.

[1] De Herdt, l. c. 7°.
[2] Vid. De Herdt, vii. 5°.
[3] Vid. De Herdt, l. c. 9°.

573. The priest, having concluded the ceremony, returns to the sacristy, preceded by the clerk, and leaves the woman to continue her thanksgiving according to her devotion.[1]

Should he be asked on this occasion to celebrate Mass in honour of the Blessed Virgin, it was decided by the Sacred Congregation that he cannot say the Mass of the Purification, but must take the votive mass assigned for the season, at the end of the Missal.[2] Moreover, the Mass enjoys no privilege, and can be said only on the days on which votive Masses are permitted by the rubric.[3]

If he be about to celebrate this votive Mass, or any other for which the colour is white, he may vest in alb and stole from the commencement, and at the conclusion of the foregoing ceremony put on the rest of the vestments for Mass.

[1] Baruff., n. 33. Caval., l. c. n. ix.
[2] 12 Mar., 1678., *in Mexican*, n. 2859, ad. 8.
[3] De Herdt, l. c. 10°.

CHAPTER XI.

ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.

DE SANCTISSIMO EUCHARISTIÆ SACRAMENTO.

§ I.—Omnibus quidem Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Sacramentis religiose sancteque tractandis, magna ac diligens cura adhibenda est; sed præcipue in administrando ac suscipiendo Sanctissimo Eucharistiæ Sacramento, quo nihil dignius, nihil sanctius et admirabilius habet Ecclesia Dei, cum in eo contineatur præcipuum et maximum Dei donum, et ipsemet omnis gratiæ et sanctitatis fons auctorque Christus Dominus.

574. The object of all the ceremonies and observances prescribed by the Church in the administration of the Blessed Eucharist, is to secure that profound reverence which is due to this adorable mystery. What she here prescribes in her ritual, is in perfect accordance with what she elsewhere prescribes in her liturgy. In all, the same object is apparent; in all, there is shown the same firm and lively faith in the real presence of "The "Word made flesh" under the sacramental veils. This faith is the very soul of her public worship. This it is which gathers round the altar and the tabernacle all that is most costly in material and all that is most elaborate in art. This it is which directs the minutest ceremony, which surrounds the consecrated host wherever it may be, whether on the altar or carried to the poorest dwelling,

with all the outward marks of respect and reverence which the circumstances will permit.

575. In the instructions which the Church here gives to her pastors, she commences by putting before them the dignity and excellence of the Eucharist, as the greatest of all the sacraments, the greatest and most astonishing of all God's gifts, inasmuch as it contains not merely grace like the other sacraments, but the author and source of all grace and sanctity, Christ our Lord Himself. "If any one denieth", says the Council of Trent, "that, in the sacrament of the most holy "Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, "the body and blood together with the soul and divinity "of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole "Christ, but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, "or in figure, or virtue, let him be anathema".[1]

§ II.—**Parochus igitur summum studium in eo ponat, ut cum ipse Venerabile hoc Sacramentum, qua decet reverentia, debitoque cultu tractet, custodiat, et administret; tum etiam populus sibi commissus religiose colat, sancte frequenterque suscipiat, præsertim in majoribus anni solemnitatibus.**

576. The pastor should show a great zeal for the honour of the Blessed Sacrament; in the first place by taking care to provide, as far as he can, whatever is requisite, in order to keep it and administer it in a manner suited to its dignity; and secondly, by inspiring those who are committed to his charge with a great devotion towards it, inducing them to adore it reverently, and to receive it with the proper dispositions frequently,

[1] Sess. xiii. can. i. Waterworth's translation.

and especially on the more solemn festivals. Further on the rubrics treat of the manner in which it is to be kept and administered, but they first treat of its reception by the faithful. The pastor is to exhort them to communicate frequently. We cannot do better than give here what the Catechism of the Council of Trent has on this subject, for it presents us with a clear view of the teaching and practice of the Church from the earliest times.

577. After referring to the decree which obliges the faithful to receive the Eucharist at least once a year, it proceeds: "Let not the faithful, however, deem it enough "to receive the body of the Lord once a year only, in "obedience to the authority of this decree: they should "approach oftener; but whether monthly, weekly, or "daily, can be decided by no fixed universal rule. St. "Augustine, however, lays down a most certain standard: "'Live', says he, 'in such a manner as to be able to re-"'ceive daily' (St. Aug., *de Verbis Domini*, ser. 28, qui "desumptus est ex Amb. lib. 5 *de Sacram.*, c. 4). It will, "therefore, be the part of the pastor frequently to admo-"nish the faithful, that as they think it necessary every "day to nurture the body, they should also not neglect "every day to feed and nourish the soul with this sacra-"ment; for the soul, it is clear, stands not less in need "of spiritual, than the body, of corporal food. And here "it will be most useful to recapitulate the inestimable "and divine advantages, which, as we have already "shown, flow from sacramental communion. The pastor "will also cite the figure of the manna, which it was ne-"cessary to use every day in order to repair the strength "of the body (*Exod.*, xvi. 21, 22); and will add the

"authorities of the Fathers, which earnestly recommend "the frequent participation of this sacrament, for the "words: 'Thou sinnest daily, receive daily', '*Quotidie* "'*peccas, quotidie sume*', are not the sentiment of St. "Augustine alone, but also, as diligent inquiry will "easily discover, the sentiment of all the fathers who "wrote on this subject (St. Ignat. *in Ep. ad Eph.*, Basil "*ad Cæsar. Patriar.*, Amb., *lib.* 5 *de Sacram.*, etc.).

"That there was once a time when the faithful re- "ceived the Eucharist daily we learn from the *Acts of the* "*Apostles*, ii. 42, etc.; for all who then professed the faith "of Christ burned with such true and sincere charity, that, "devoting themselves, as they did unceasingly, to prayer "and other works of piety, they were found prepared to "receive every day the sacred mysteries of the Lord's "body. This practice, which seems to have been inter- "rupted, was again partially revived by St. Anacletus, "Pope and Martyr, who commanded that the ministers "assisting at the sacrifice of the Mass should communi- "cate; an ordinance, declares the pontiff, of apostolic in- "stitution (S. Anacl., *Ep.* 2, et citatur *de Cons. dist.* 2 *c.* "*Peracta*). It was also for a long time a practice in the "Church, that as soon as the sacrifice was ended, the "priest, turning to the congregation, invited the faithful "to the holy table in these words: 'Venite fratres ad "'Communionem', 'Come, brothers, to the Communion'; "and those who were prepared then received the holy "mysteries with the greatest devotion (Dionys., *de Eccl.* "*Hier.*, c. 3. Greg., *lib.* 2, *dial.* c. 23; *de Consec. dist.* "2, c. 13). But subsequently, when charity and devo- "tion had grown so cold that the faithful very rarely ap-

"proached the communion, it was decreed by Pope "Fabian that all should communicate thrice every year, "at Christmas, at Easter, and at Pentecost; a decree "which was subsequently confirmed by many councils; "particularly by the first of Agatha (S. Fab., *Epis.* 3, *ad* "*Hilar. Ep.*, cit *de Consecr.*, *dist.* 2 cap *Etsi.*, Concil. "Turon., iii. c. 50; Conc. Agath, c. 38). When at "length, such was the decay of piety that not only was "this holy and salutary ordinance unobserved, but com- "munion was deferred even for years, it was decreed in "the Council of Lateran that all the faithful should com- "municate at least once a year, at Easter, and that those "who might have neglected to do so should be prohibited "access to the church" (Conc. Later. Can. 1, cit. *de pœn. et remiss.*, c. *Omnis.* et Trid., sess. 13, can. 9).[1]

578. On the advantages of frequent communion, and the dispositions to be required by the confessor in those who are admitted to it, we must refer to St. Liguori, whose authority is the great guide of confessors at the present day. He treats the subject at length in his *Praxis Confessarii.*[2] What he there teaches regarding the dispositions required, appears to be pretty fairly summed up in the following passage, from which it will be seen that by frequent communion he means communion at least several times in the week. It may be found in the chapter on communion, printed with the translation of his "*Visits to the Blessed Sacrament*". "A soul that commits deliberate venial sins by telling "wilful lies, by vanity of dress, by feelings of rancour, or

[1] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 60 et 61. [2] Cap. 9. § iv. n. 148 et seq.

"by inordinate attachments, or who is guilty of any "other similar faults which she knows to be an obstacle "to her advancement in perfection, and who does not en- "deavour to correct these defects, cannot be permitted to "communicate more frequently than once a week. To "receive strength to preserve her from falling into mortal "sins, she may be allowed communion every eight days. "For my part, I should have great difficulty in allowing "frequent communion to persons disposed to persevere in "any defect which, though not clearly a venial sin, would "be certainly contrary to perfection, particularly if it "were a defect against humility or obedience. But if a "soul has no affection for any venial sin, if she abstains "from deliberate venial sins, and attends to prayer and the "mortification of her passions and senses, the confessor "may permit her to communicate three, four, or even five "times in the week. And when a soul has attained a con- "siderable degree of perfection, when she spends several "hours in the day at prayer, and has moreover conquered "the greater part of her evil inclinations, she may, accor- "ding to St. Francis de Sales (*Introd. to a Devout Life*, "chap. 20), be allowed communion every day. For, as "St. Prosper says, this is the perfection which a person "subject to human frailty can attain in this life".[1]

§ III.—Ideo populum sæpius admonebit qua præparatione, et quanto animi religione ac pietate, et humili etiam corporis habitu ad tam divinum Sacramentum debeat accedere, ut præmissa Sacramentali Confessione, omnes saltem a media nocte jejuni, et utroque genu flexo,

[1] *On Communion*, n. 7

Sacramentum humiliter adorent, ac reverenter suscipiant, viris quantum fieri potest a mulieribus separatis.

579. The faithful are to be carefully instructed as to the preparation they must make when about to receive the Holy Communion. Certain dispositions both of soul and body are required. These dispositions are very fully explained in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. "The first preparation", it says, "which the faithful should "make, is to distinguish table from table, this sacred table "from profane tables, this celestial bread from common "bread. This we do when we firmly believe that the "Eucharist really and truly contains the body and blood "of the Lord, of Him whom the angels adore in heaven "(*Psal.*, xcvi. 8; *Heb.*, i. 6), at whose nod the pillars of "heaven fear and tremble (*Job*, xxvi. ii.), of whose glory "the heavens and earth are full (*Isaias*, vi. 3). This is to "discern the body of the Lord in accordance with the "admonition of the Apostle (I. *Cor.*, xi. 29), venerating "rather, as we ought, the greatness of the mystery, than "too curiously and disputatiously investigating its truth".[1]

580. If a person be conscious of mortal sin, he cannot approach the holy table until he has purified his soul by the sacrament of penance. "We should next carefully "examine our consciences, says the Catechism,[2] lest per-"haps they be defiled by some mortal sin, of which it is "necessary to repent, in order to be cleansed from its "defilement by the salutary medicine of contrition and "confession; for the Council of Trent has declared that

[1] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 57. [2] Loc. cit.

"no one conscious of mortal sin, and having an opportu-
"nity of a confessor, however contrite he may deem him-
"self, is to receive the Holy Eucharist until he has been
"purified by sacramental confession (Sess. xii., can. 11)".

The Council teaches[1] that this obligation of confession for such as are conscious of mortal sin is included in the probation required by the apostle,[2] and theologians commonly teach that it is imposed even by divine precept.[3] To receive any other sacrament, it is enough that the sinner be contrite, or that he *bona fide* believe himself to be contrite; but he cannot receive the Eucharist, however contrite he may think himself, until he has gone to confession, if he has an opportunity.[4] That any one conscious of mortal sin may lawfully communicate without previous confession, these two things must concur. There must be no opportunity of confessing, and there must be a moral necessity of communicating.[5]

581. The words of the rubric here seem to extend the obligation of confession as a preparation for communion to all the faithful. In strictness it applies only to those who are conscious of mortal sin. But confession is recommended even to those who are not, that they may approach with greater purity of soul and greater fervour, and in practice it may be said that it is required of all who communicate only seldom. The pastor, then, is perfectly justified in laying it down as a general rule, that confession is a necessary preparation for communion; but he should explain that only those

[1] Cap. vii. [2] I. Cor., xi. 28. [3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 256.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 108 et seq.
[5] St. Lig. n. 255 in parenth. Vid. etiam, n. 259 et seq.

who are conscious of mortal sin would be guilty of sacrilege by communicating without previous confession.

582. He would do well also, in giving instructions on this subject, to state, in order to prevent the perplexity which may easily happen to some, that if a person when just about to communicate, so that he cannot retire without risk of injury to his character, remembers a sin which he inculpably omitted in his confession, he may nevertheless receive communion, and is merely required to mention that sin in his next confession. All theologians are agreed on this decision.[1] Collet[2] and some others go further, and would give the same decision even when the person could abstain from communion without any injury to his character, and could even go to confession without inconvenience. Because that sin, they say, has been remitted, though indirectly, by the confession already made, and the Council of Trent merely requires that no one conscious of mortal sin, however contrite he may think himself, shall approach without being purified by previous sacramental confession. He is still bound, no doubt, to confess that sin, but he is not bound till the precept of confession urges. St. Liguori regards this opinion as very probable.[3]

583. We have already seen,[4] the dispositions required in those who are allowed frequent communion. It is not required, nor even recommended, that they should go to confession before every communion. "Some persons",

[1] St. Lig, n. 257. Prima Sententia *Excipiunt tamen.*
[2] *De Eucharistia*, cap. vi. art. iii. Concl. iv. Quær. 2.
[3] Ibid. *Secunda Sententia.*
[4] Supra, n. 578.

says St. Liguori, "of very delicate consciences have been "in the habit of going to confession every day. But for "the generality of spiritual souls, and particularly for "the scrupulous, it will be sufficient to confess their sins "once, or at most twice a week. In his treatise on com- "munion, Father Barisoni, resting on the authority of St. "Ambrose and of many other authors, says, that when a "spiritual soul feels her conscience burdened with a "venial sin which she has not an opportunity of confess- "ing, she ought not to abstain from the Holy Commu- "nion. St. Francis de Sales gives the same advice in "one of his letters. The holy Council of Trent teaches, "that for the remission of venial sins, there are other "means, such as acts of contrition, or of charity. It is "better to employ these means to purify the soul from a "venial sin, than to be deprived of communion in conse- "quence of not having an opportunity of going to confes- "sion. And a learned director has said, that it is some- "times more profitable to a timorous soul to prepare for "the Holy Communion by her own acts than by confes- "sion, because she then makes more fervent acts of "sorrow, of humility, and confidence".[1]

584. So much for the dispositions of the soul. But the body also must be prepared, as we are here admonished by the rubric. The exterior should be humble and modest. No pomp or vanity in the dress or manner. St. Charles in his "Instructions",[2] directs pastors to admonish the faithful, and especially women, that they

[1] *Praxis Conf.*, n. 148.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. *Instruct. Sacr. Com.*, pag. 611.

must present themselves for Communion in a modest dress, and to refuse Communion to those who do not. St. Liguori also teaches that Communion should be refused to one who "nimis immodeste accedat".[1] The dress, however, should be decent, according to one's condition, and particular attention should be paid to cleanliness.[2] Martene shows that in the early ages the faithful never approached without having carefully washed their hands and face.[3]

St. Charles[4] would require men to lay aside their arms. St. Liguori says it is congruous that they should; but he excepts the military knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who should wear their swords.[5]

Priests when they communicate "more laicorum", should wear a surplice and stole.[6]

585. "The dignity of so great a sacrament also de-"mands", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that for some days previous to communion, married "persons abstain from the marriage debt".[7] Theologians, however, commonly teach that the obligation of abstaining, even on the day of communion, is only *sub levi;* and if the act be free from sin, there is no obligation, it is only of counsel, to abstain.[8]

586. The disposition of body most strictly required is, that the communicant be fasting from the previous midnight. The Blessed Eucharist was instituted by our

[1] Lib. vi. n. 275.
[2] St. Lig., ibid.
[3] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. iv. art. x. n. vii.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Loc. cit.
[6] Vid. infra, chap. xii. § vi.
[7] Loc. cit. n. 58.
[8] St. Lig. n. 273.

Lord after supper, and for a short time was celebrated and administered only after supper. Martene shows that for the first three centuries, and even much later, it was still in many places celebrated after supper.[1] But there is little doubt that in others the custom of receiving communion fasting prevailed from the very time of the Apostles, though it is not quite certain at what date it became obligatory throughout the whole Church.[2] The Catechism of the Council of Trent says that "the practice of receiving it fasting, introduced, as ancient writers record, "by the Apostles, has always been retained and observed".[3]

587. The fast required is to be understood of the natural fast or entire abstinence from any thing in the way of meat or drink. The Catechism of the Council of Trent says: "We are to approach the holy table fasting, "having not at all eaten or drank at least from the preceding midnight up to the very moment of receiving "the Holy Eucharist".[4]

St. Charles, in his instructions, recommends the communicant to fast also the previous day, or at least to sup sparingly. The fast thus recommended, however, is to be understood of an ecclesiastical fast, that is, of a fast on a single meal and collation, according to the law of the Church.

This may serve to explain what is meant by saying that the communicant should be fasting *at least* from the preceding midnight, "saltem a media nocte", for it was

[1] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit*, lib. i. cap. iii. art. iv.
[2] Cfr. Chardon, *Hist. des Sacrem.* liv. I^re^ sect III^me^ chap. vii.
[3] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 6. [4] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 58.

the practice of many to observe an ecclesiastical fast on the previous day.

588. The smallest quantity in the way of food or drink is sufficient to violate this natural fast. No "levi-" "tas materiæ" is admitted here, as it is when there is question of violating the ecclesiastical fast.[1] But then what is taken must be, according to the common opinion of theologians, in the first place, something external "ab extrinseco". Hence, to swallow one's saliva, or blood proceeding from the gums or teeth, etc., is no violation of the natural fast.

Secondly, it must be taken as food or drink. Hence it is not a violation of the fast, to snuff or smoke tobacco, though some particles may reach the stomach, nor to swallow along with the saliva some drops of the water used in washing the mouth, or particles of the food taken on the previous day that may have adhered to the gums, or may have been fastened in the teeth.[2] Here something depends on the intention. If any of these things be swallowed purposely, the fast, according to a very probable opinion, is violated; but it is not, if they be inhaled with the breath or get mixed with the saliva, and thus pass into the stomach unintentionally. St. Liguori observes that one should not be scrupulous in this matter.

Thirdly, it must be a something which affords nutriment, or is capable of being digested. Hence, to swallow a bit of metal, a small pebble, or the like, does not violate the fast.[3]

[1] St. Lig., n. 278.

[2] Vid. Rub. Missalis, *De Defectibus*, § ix. n. 3.

[3] St. Lig., n. 279 et seq.

589. There are certain cases, however, in which the Holy Eucharist may be received by those who are not fasting. 1° When it is administered to those who are in danger of death, as we shall see in treating of the viaticum.[1] 2° When it is received in order to protect it from irreverence. 3° When it is received in order to avoid scandal, as *e.g.*, if a priest after having commenced mass remembers that he has broken the fast; but if he remembers it before commencing, he can almost always remove the scandal by simply stating what has happened. 4° When it is received in order to complete the sacrifice in the various cases mentioned in the rubrics of the missal.[2]

590. The communicant should kneel on both knees and adore the Blessed Sacrament before receiving it, according to that of St. Augustine. "Nemo illam car-"nem manducat nisi prius adoraverit" (*in Psal.* 98).[3] In the early ages the communicants received standing, and this is still the custom in the Oriental Church;[4] but in the Western Church they are required to be kneeling.

591. Care must be taken also that men and women communicate apart from each other, at different hours, or at different places in the church.

St. Charles directs the pastor to prepare two altars, one for men and the other for women, especially if there be a great concourse of communicants.[5] In these coun-

[1] Infra, chap. xiv. § vi.

[2] *De Defectibus*, § iii. n. 5; § iv. n. 5 et 6; § x. n. 3. Vid. St. Lig., n. 287 et seq.

[3] Cit. apud Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, lib. ii. cap. xxiv.

[4] Cfr. Martene, lib. i. cap. iv. art. x. n. vii.

[5] Act. pars. iv. Inst. Euch. § *De Preparatione quam adhibebit Parochus*, etc., pag. 426.

tries the arrangements to be made for this purpose, will of course depend on the accommodation which the church affords, the number of communicants, the number of masses celebrated, and other circumstances which the prudent pastor will take into account. The rubric is clearly an important one and he should make provision, as best he can, for carrying out what it prescribes.

§ IV.—**Moneantur præterea communicantes, ut sumpto Sacramento non statim ab Ecclesia discedant, aut colloquantur, nec statim vagis oculis circumspiciant, aut expuant, neque de libro statim orationes recitent, ne Sacramenti species de ore decidant; sed, qua par est devotione, aliquantisper in oratione permaneant, gratias agentes Deo de tam singulari beneficio, atque etiam de sanctissima Passione Dominica, in cujus memoriam hoc mysterium celebratur et sumitur.**

592. This rubric, as Baruffaldi observes,[1] recommends rather than prescribes. But it contains a great deal of important instruction as to what should be done immediately after communion; and the pastor should be careful to convey this instruction to his flock. To look about one, or to converse with others just after receiving, could hardly be excused from a positive irreverence to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. To spit out, or to recite prayers, especially with considerable action of the organs, while the sacred species is still in the mouth, would be manifestly attended with the danger of allowing some particles to drop from the mouth. The communicant, then, is to be warned against all this, and to be advised,

[1] Tit. xxiii. n. 45.

before using his prayer book, to spend a few moments in mental prayer and thanksgiving to God for the incomparable gift he has received, devoutly calling to mind our Saviour's passion and death, of which the Blessed Eucharist is the perpetual memorial.

593. St. Charles gives several most useful instructions on this subject. According to these instructions, the communicant, in receiving the Blessed Sacrament, should hold the communion cloth with both hands under the chin. He should keep the face somewhat elevated, and open the mouth, so that the priest, in placing the Sacred Host on the tongue, may not be obliged to touch the beard, lips, or teeth.

The extremity of the tongue should rest on the lower teeth and not protrude beyond them, nor should the tongue be moved from that position until the priest has withdrawn his hand after placing the sacred particle on it.

He should abstain from sighing or breathing in such a way that the breath might reach any of the sacred particles.

When the priest has withdrawn his hand, he should incline his head a little, and reverently swallow the Sacred Host, taking care, if possible, not to raise the tongue to the palate. Having remained in the same place for about the space of a "Pater" and "Ave", he should go to receive the purification,[1] unless it be administered where he is, and then withdraw to some quiet spot in the church where he will make his thanksgiving on his knees, turned towards the high altar.

[1] Not now in use,—Vid. infra, chap. xii. § i.

He should not spit out for at least a quarter of an hour, but if he cannot avoid it, he ought to do so in a place where people do not tread.

He should not take food for half an hour, or at least a quarter of an hour after communion, and he should endeavour to keep himself recollected and employ himself in exercises of piety during the day.[1]

594. In giving instructions on this matter the pastor must be careful to distinguish what is only recommended as becoming, from what is of strict obligation. Though it is meet that the communicant abstain from spitting immediately after communion, theologians commonly say it is no sin, provided no fragment or particle remains in the mouth.[2]

According to an ancient canon, the communicant was obliged to continue his fast till the hour of sext.[3] This observance had fallen into disuse long before the time of St. Thomas, and some say it is now no sin to take food immediately after communion. But, according to the more probable opinion, it cannot be excused from venial sin, unless there be some reasonable cause, as *e.g.*, if a member of a religious community were obliged to go to the refectory at a fixed hour. The reason is, that there is a certain irreverence in taking food while the consecrated species is still unaltered in the stomach.[4] It remains

[1] *Acta Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. De Sacramento Sanctissimo Eucharistiæ. § *De præparatione corporis*, pag. 425. § *Quæ observentur post communionem*, pag. 426; et *Instructiones civitatis et Diœceseos Pastoribus pro administranda in suis Ecclesiis Eucharistia*, pag. 600 et seq.

[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 283.

[3] Cit. apud. St. Lig., l. c.

[4] St. Lig., ibid.

unaltered, however, only a very short time, not more, probably, than one or two minutes in laics, nor more than eight or nine minutes in priests, who receive a large host as well as the chalice; certainly not more than a quarter of an hour in any one, provided the stomach be healthy.[1]

§ V.—**Curare porro debet, ut perpetuo aliquot Particulæ consecratæ eo numero, qui usui infirmorum et aliorum Fidelium communioni satis esse possit, conserventur in pyxide ex solida decentique materia, eaque munda, et suo operculo bene clausa, albo velo cooperta, et quantum res ferat, ornato in tabernaculo clave obserato.**

595. In the first ages the faithful were permitted to carry the Blessed Eucharist to their houses and retain it there, that they might receive it themselves when they were unable to assist at the celebration of the holy mysteries. It was often sent to them also by the hands of deacons or acolytes. This was the case particularly during the fury of the persecutions, when they were in constant danger of being seized and dragged to prison or execution, and when it was therefore important that they should not be deprived of the consolation and the strength to be derived from the Holy Eucharist. The solitaries of the deserts were not, it is true, so far removed from priests and churches as is commonly supposed;[2] but many of them were at a great distance, and there is no doubt that these were allowed to keep the Blessed Sacrament by them, and communicate with their own hands.[3]

[1] St. Lig., n. 225. Vid. De Lugo, Disp. x. sec. iii. n. 54.

[2] Cfr. Dalgairns *on Holy Communion*, chap. vi. pag. 153 et seq.

[3] Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. v. art. i. Caval., vol. iv. cap. vi. *De Asserv. SS. Sacramenti.*

This usage was manifestly open to many abuses, and was therefore abolished in many places soon after peace was given to the Church. Commencing in Spain, the abolition was gradually extended to other places, though not completed everywhere until about the twelfth century.[1]

596. Even while this usage prevailed, the Blessed Sacrament was at the same time kept in the churches or places where the sacred mysteries were celebrated. It was enclosed in dove-shaped vessels of gold or silver, which were suspended over the altar. These "Columbæ aureæ" and "Columbæ argenteæ", are frequently mentioned in ecclesiastical writers after the fourth century. Some had the form of a turret, and were hence called "Turres".[2]

As the permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in their houses was gradually withdrawn from the faithful, the right of reserving it, of course, became more and more confined to the churches, until at length, by a general law, it became exclusively confined to them, as it has been, at least since the fourth Council of Lateran.[3]

597. It is not permitted, however, to keep it in every church. Its administration properly belongs to the pastor, and, therefore, the right of keeping it is confined to cathedral and parochial churches,[4] and is not allowed in others without the permission of the Holy See. This has been declared in several answers of the Sacred Congrega-

[1] Martene, l. c. Caval., l. c. Vid. Melanges Theologiques, IV^me^ Serie, II^me^ Cahier, pag. 210 et seq.

[2] Vid. Catal., tit. iv. cap. i. § v. per totum.

[3] Cfr. Mel. Theol., l. c.

[4] Baruff., n. 12. Vid. infra, chap. xiii. § i.

tion.[1] The only exception is the case of a non-parochial church where it has been kept from time immemorial. But this immemorial usage. according to Benedict XIV., founds a presumption that the church had received at one time the requisite permission.[2]

The Blessed Sacrament not only may be kept, but ought to be kept in every parochial church.[3] The bishop is even directed to provide for the necessary expense, if the parish cannot defray it, by having alms collected for the purpose.[4]

The churches of Regulars usually have the privilege of keeping the Blessed Sacrament, and the Sacred Congregation has declared that it ought to be kept in them.[5] In fact they may be regarded as in a manner parochial churches with respect to the members of the religious community.[6]

When a convent of nuns is canonically erected, the Blessed Sacrament may be kept in the church of the convent.[7] It must, however, be a public church, for the Council of Trent forbids the Blessed Sacrament to be kept in the choir, or within the enclosure of the religious.[8]

[1] Cong. Epis. 15 Jan., 1610. Cong. Conc. 8 Mar. 1668, et 3 Jan., 1683, cit. apud. Falise, *Decr. Authent.*, etc. V. *De Asserv. SS. Euch.* in notis.

[2] Constit. *Quamvis justo*, 30 Apr., 1749, § 24.

[3] Congr. Episcop. 28 Jan., 1603. apud. Caval., tom. iv. cap. vi. *De Asserv. SS. Sacram.*, Decr. i.

[4] Cong. Episc., 14 Mar., 1614, et Cong. Conc., 22 Mar., 1594. apud. Caval., loc. cit.

[5] Cong. Epis., 25 Maii., 1635, cit. ibid. [6] Cfr. Caval., l. c. n. ii.

[7] S. C. R., 16 April, 1644, *in Marianen*, n. 1496.

[8] Sess. XXV. cap. 10. *De Reg. et Monial.*

That the convent be canonically erected, it is necessary that the nuns make solemn vows and observe strict enclosure,[1] and that the house be established with the consent of the Holy See.[2] These are the churches in which the Blessed Sacrament may be kept without any special indult.

But in other churches, or in private oratories, even for the use of religious, or in any other place whatever, it can be kept only with the permission of the Holy See. The Ordinary can give permission in particular cases and for a short time, but without special faculties from the Holy See, he cannot give permission to have it kept permanently.[3]

598. In Ireland, and in other countries similarly circumstanced, there are many parish churches in which the Blessed Sacrament cannot be permanently kept on account of the danger of sacrilege. Besides, the priest sometimes lives at so great a distance from the church, that he could not without very great inconvenience go to the church for it as often as it is necessary to bring it to the sick. To provide for such cases, special faculties are granted by the Holy See. Amongst the faculties received by the Irish bishops, and which they can communicate to others, is the following: "Deferendi Sanctissi-"mum Sacramentum occulte ad Infirmos sine lumine, "illudque sine eodem retinendi pro iisdem infirmis, in "loco tamen decenti, si ab hæreticis aut infidelibus sit "periculum sacrilegii".[4] Hence, generally speaking, in

[1] Cfr. Melanges Theologiques, l. c. p. 219.
[2] Bened. XIV. *De Synod. Dioces.*, lib, ix. cap i. n. 9.
[3] Vid. Caval., cap. vi. Decr. iv. [4] Formula VI^ta n. 21.

this country priests have permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in their houses. It ought to be, however, "in loco decenti". The Synod of Thurles earnestly recommends that a room be set apart, or at least that a tabernacle be provided, for the purpose.[1] There is no one who cannot provide a little tabernacle; of late years many have been constructed expressly for this purpose: and it may be hoped that very soon every priest who keeps the Blessed Sacrament in his house will have one.

599. The rubric here directs the pastor to have at all times, such a number of consecrated particles as may suffice for the communion of the sick, and also of the other faithful who may require to receive "extra missam". St. Charles directed that, at least, five should be so kept.[2] The vessel in which they are kept is called a "pyxis". It is often called also a "ciborium". In every parochial church there ought to be two, a larger one for communion in the church, and a smaller one for communion of the sick.[3] With us the larger one is usually called a "ciborium", and the smaller one a "pyxis". Writers on the rubrics, however, make no distinction between these words as applied to vessels containing the Blessed Eucharist, but they sometimes use the word "ciborium" to signify the tabernacle in which the pyxis is kept,[4] and also to signify a press or safe such as that in which the holy oils are kept in the baptistery.[5]

600. The rubric does not determine the material of

[1] *De Eucharistia*, n. 23.
[2] Instruc. Euchar. § *De custodia Sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ*, pag. 424.
[3] Baruff., tit. xxiii. n. 54.
[4] Catal., tit. iv. cap. § v. n. v.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 266.

which the ciborium should be made, further than that it should be solid and suitable "**ex solida decentique materia**". It should not, then, be of glass or any fragile substance. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops is more explicit. It declares that the material should not be ivory but silver, gilt within.[1] It is usually made of the same material as the chalice, sometimes of gold, but mostly of silver gilt inside.

St. Charles gives minute instructions both as to the material and shape. "The pyxis", he says,[2] "should be of "gold, or at least of pure silver, gilt inside, if not both "inside and outside. The foot or stem should be six "inches in length, so that it may be easy to hold it firmly "in the hand. The 'nodus', or knob in the centre of "the stem, may be suitably enchased, but should not be "embossed in such a way as to make it inconvenient for "the hand in holding it. The cup may be in shape either "circular or oval, the depth and width being correctly pro-"portioned to each other. It should have a slight orbi-"cular eminence in the centre of the bottom, and near "the edge a rim on which the cover may rest. The cover, "at the lowest part, must correspond to the shape of the "pyxis, and should have a little hook at each side to fasten "it on. It should taper upwards like a cone, and be sur-"mounted by a cross, or by the figure of our Lord cruci-"fied, or rising from the dead". He concludes by adding that, where poverty will allow no better, the bishop may permit the pyxis and cover to be of brass or tin gilt.

[1] 26 Jul., 1588. cit. apud. Caval., cap. i. decr. x. n. iv.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. Instruct. supell. Eccl. lib. ii. § *De Pyxide*, pag. 528.

We may observe that the "uncia" of St. Charles, is only about three-fourths of our inch, so that the six inches mentioned as the length of the stem, are equal only to four and one-half of our inches. The reason of having the bottom raised at the centre, is to enable the priest the more easily to take up the last particles, which it would be otherwise difficult to get hold of with the thumb and index. The hooks for fastening the cover are now generally dispensed with, as the cover is easily made fast enough without them.

601. The rubric directs that the pyxis be covered with a white veil. This veil should be of silk or satin, and richly embroidered. According to St. Charles,[1] it should be embroidered with gold or silver, or, better still, it should be of gold or silver cloth, with fringes of the same material. It is usually attached to the top of the cover, being sometimes fastened to the foot of the cross or figure which surmounts it, and thus hangs in loose folds around the pyxis. Great care must be taken in covering and uncovering the pyxis, that the veil do not come in contact with the corporal before the corporal is purified, as the folds of the veil might easily take up minute fragments. The difficulty of guarding against this is probably the reason why in some places the veil is not in use.

602. The pyxis does not require to be consecrated.[2] It is blessed by the bishop, or by a priest having the requisite faculties, according to the form given in the ritual or in the missal, and entitled "Benedictio Tabernaculi "seu vasculi pro sacrosancta Eucharistia conservanda".

[1] Loc. cit. § *De velis pyxidis.* [2] St. Lig., n. 384.

Some hold that this blessing, though laudable, is not of precept, and that consequently the pyxis may be used without it. This is the opinion of Suarez, De Lugo, and other great authorities cited by St. Liguori.[1] There is no evidence, they say, of a precept. The fact that a form of benediction for it is given in the ritual or missal, is not enough; for benedictions are given there, which, though it be pious and laudable to use them, are certainly not of precept. But St. Liguori himself adopts as more probable the opinion of Benedict XIV., Collet, and others, who maintain that this benediction is of precept. The rubric of the missal favours this opinion, when it directs the priest who is about to consecrate a number of particles, to place them "**in aliquo calice consecrato vel in "vase mundo benedicto**".[2] St. Liguori seems, however, to imply that the precept does not bind *sub gravi*.[3]

A priest who has faculties to bless vestments, corporals, etc., can also bless the pyxis. This is the common opinion of rubricists,[4] and is implied, if not expressly decided, by an answer of the Sacred Congregation.[5]

What has been said of the pyxis, may be said also of the lunette of a remonstrance, and it would be laudable to have even the remonstrance itself blessed, the same form of benediction being used for all.[6]

[1] Lib. vi. n. 385.

[2] *Ritus servandus in Celebratione Missæ*, tit. ii. n. 3.

[3] Vid. St. Lig., l. c.

[4] Gavan., pars. ii. tit. ii. n. 3, lit. p. Baruff., tit. xxiii. n. 56. Collet, *Traité Des Saints Mysteres*, chap. ix. n. 7. De Herdt, pars. i. n. 55. ii.

[5] 17 Maii. 1760, *in Calagur. et Calceat*, n. 4290.

[6] Vid. De Herdt, l. c.

603. "The Church", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "has prohibited by a law any but consecrated "persons, unless in some case of great necessity, to dare "handle or touch the sacred vessels, the linen, or other "instruments necessary to its completion".[1] Hence, no one, who is not in deacon's orders, is permitted to touch a sacred vessel of any kind while it actually contains the Holy Eucharist. He would be guilty of grievous sin by doing so.[2]

When it does not actually contain the Holy Eucharist, it may be handled by laics, according to St. Liguori, "si "adsit rationabilis causa, secluso scandalo et contemptu", but not otherwise without venial sin, although some authors, whom he cites, make no restriction in this case, and say that it may be freely handled by any one, when it does not contain the Blessed Eucharist.[3] Benedict XIV. says[4] that all who are in orders, even those who have received only the first tonsure, are, by custom, allowed to handle the sacred vessels when empty, if they have any reason for doing so . . . . "si aliqua causa inter- "cedat". The same privilege is extended also, according to St. Liguori,[5] to lay-brothers, nuns, and in general to all who perform the duties of sacristan.

This question is discussed at some length in the "Me- "langes Theologiques".[7] The writer distinguishes vessels that are consecrated, as the chalice, from those that are

[1] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 67.
[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 382.
[3] St. Lig., l. c.
[4] *Inst.* xxxiv. n. 18.
[5] Loc. cit.
[6] Cfr. Bouvier, *De Eucharistia*, cap. vi. art. vi. § i. 12 et seq.
[7] IV^me^ Serie, III^me^ Cahier, p. 376, etc.

merely blessed, as the ciborium. According to him, theologians speak only of the former, and he maintains that the latter may be handled by any one after they have been purified, just as corporals may be handled by any one after they have been washed. He concludes, therefore, that they may be cleansed or repaired by laics without the least scruple, and that any custom to the contrary is founded on error. There is good reason, no doubt, for this distinction, and we believe it is recognized to some extent—at least so far, that in many places a laic would have less scruple in handling a ciborium than in handling a chalice. It is admitted also that corporals, after having been washed by a person in holy orders, may be freely handled by laics,[1] and it is difficult to get over the parity urged by the "Melanges", between the ciborium after it is purified, and the corporal after it is washed, for all seem to be agreed that in this matter the corporal and the ciborium are to be treated alike: "idem "quod dictum est", says St. Liguori, "de tactu sacrorum "vasorum dicendum est de tactu corporalium".[2]

At the same time, we think, custom does not acknowledge the parity in the precise point urged by the "Melanges". It is plain from his words, that St. Liguori, in the place cited, includes all vessels, whether consecrated or merely blessed, that are used for containing the Eucharistic species, and that the decision he gives applies to the ciborium and the lunette, as well as to the chalice. Bouvier says that the ciborium, though blessed, may be

[1] Merati, pars. ii. tit. i. rub. i. n. xvi. Lacroix, lib. vi. pars. ii. n. 358. Collet, *De Eucharistia*, pars. ii. cap. ix. art. ii. sect. viii. Quær. 8.

[2] Loc. cit.

handled by any one *before* it has been used to contain the Blessed Sacrament, but afterwards only by those who are allowed to handle the chalice. The remonstrance, however, he would permit to be handled by any one, when the lunette is removed.[1]

The custom above mentioned, in favour of all who are in tonsure, and of all laics who perform the duties of sacristan, is not recognized everywhere. In France, in the time of Collet,[2] the law above referred to by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, was still in force, so that only those in holy orders were permitted to handle the sacred vessels; and, although it would appear from Bouvier[3] that, by the present usage, inferior clerics are permitted to do so, it is still usual, he says,[4] for laics who may require to touch the sacred vessels, to get leave from the bishop or his vicar-general. The decision of St. Liguori clearly implies that a sacred vessel might be handled by a laic for the purpose of repairing it, for then there is a "rationabilis causa". Yet even in this case, if the vessel still retains its consecration, *e.g.*, a chalice, requiring merely to have the gilding renewed, Gardellini would have the workmen get leave from the ordinary.[5]

In Ireland the law of the Church in this matter has suffered no relaxation, and with us, therefore, no one who is not in holy orders ventures to handle the sacred vessels without the leave of the ordinary.

604. The pyxis is kept in the tabernacle, which is treated of in the next rubric. Here it is merely stated

[1] Loc. cit. § ii. 6°.
[2] Vid. loc. cit.
[3] Loc. cit. § i. 12°
[4] Loc. cit. n. 14°.
[5] *Annotat.*, in Decr. S. C. R. 20 Apr. 1822, n. 4588.

that it must be carefully locked. The keys of the tabernacle, of which there ought to be two,[1] should be kept by the parish priest, or priest who has charge of the church, and by no other.[2] Many recommend that they be gilt or plated.[3]

§ VI.—**Hoc autem tabernaculum conopeo decenter opertum, atque ab omni alia re vacuum, in Altari majori, vel in alio, quod veneratioui et cultui tanti Sacramenti commodius ac decentius videatur, sit collocatum, ita ut nullum aliis sacris functionibus, aut Ecclesiasticis officiis impedimentum afferatur.**

605. According to a decree of the Congregation of Bishops, the tabernacle ought, generally speaking, to be of wood, gilt on the outside, and suitably lined inside with silk: "Tabernaculum regulariter debet esse ligneum, "extra deauratum, intus vero aliquo panno serico decen-"ter contectum".[4] Cavalieri[5] observes that this decree, as is plain from the word *regulariter*, does not hinder the tabernacle from being made of a material stronger and more precious than wood. St. Charles recommends that in the principal churches it be of silver or brass gilt, or of precious marble, but having the interior lined with wood as a protection against damp.[6] Amongst those recently

[1] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 14. ii. 5°.

[2] Sac. Cong. Concil., 14 Nov. 1693. Cit. apud Falise, *Dec. Authen.*, etc. V. *De Asserv. SS. Euch.*, note 14. Vid. Ferraris, V. *Tabernaculum*, n. 4 et seq.

[3] Baruff., tit. xxiii. n. 62. De Herdt, l. c.

[4] Cong. Episcop. 26 Oct., 1575. apud Falise, loc. cit. note 9.

[5] Tom. iv. cap. vi. *De Asservatione SS. Sacramenti*, Decr. x.

[6] Instruct. Fabric. Eccl. lib. i. cap. xiii. *De Tabernaculo SS. Eucharistia*, pag. 472.

constructed in Ireland and England, a considerable number are of wrought iron, being in fact safes, encased in gilt wood or sculptured stone. These are very much approved of by the parochial clergy on account of their great strength, and the consequent security they give against the depredation of thieves and against fire.

606. The form of the tabernacle is not precisely fixed by any authority. It may be round, square, hexagonal, etc., according to taste or convenience. Whatever be the shape, however, it should be surmounted by a cross. This is not prescribed in the rubric, but writers on the rubrics, treating of the tabernacle, either expressly say, or clearly suppose, that there is at least a small cross placed over it, or fixed on its summit.[1]

607. It has been decided by the Sacred Congregation,[2] that the tabernacle cannot be made the base or support of a sacred picture or relic, even a relic of the true cross, or of some of the other instruments of our Lord's passion. Gardellini observes[3] that there would be a certain want of reverence in making it serve as such, or indeed in making it serve any other purpose than that of containing the Blessed Sacrament, as the rubric here requires that it be "**ab omni alia re vacuum**". Besides, he says, the top of the tabernacle should not be a flat surface but round. A writer in the "Melanges Theologiques",[4] likewise main-

[1] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 14. ii. 3°. Benedict XIV., Encycl. *Accepimus*, 16 Jul., 1746, *De retinenda Crucifixi imagine*, etc. Cfr. Gardellini, *Annotat. in Decr. generale*, S. R. C., 3 April, 1821, ad 6, n. 4578, et *in Decr.* 17 Sept., 1822, ad 8, n. 4590.

[2] 3 April, 1821, *Decr. gen.* ad 6, n. 4578; 12 Mar., 1836, *in Trident.* ad 1. n. 4777. [3] *Annot. in Decr. gen.* ad 6. 3 April, 1821, n. 4578.

[4] IV^me^ Serie. 3^me^ Cahier, p. 360.

tains that the top should be spherical or conical, and should form one solid piece with the cross surmounting it.

It certainly does seem more in accordance with the spirit of the rubric and of the decrees of the Sacred Congregation just cited, to have the tabernacle so constructed and placed that it would be unnecessary, in any circumstances, to make it serve as a support. At the same time there is nothing in the rubric, nor in any decision we have seen, which would make it unlawful to put on the tabernacle, as on a support, the crucifix which the rubric of the missal requires to be placed between the candles at mass. It is true that a small cross or crucifix placed over the tabernacle has been declared insufficient to satisfy the rubric of the missal.[2] But it is evident from Merati,[3] Cavalieri,[4] Benedict XIV.,[5] and Gardellini himself,[6] that this is solely and entirely on the supposition that the cross so placed is too small, for it should be such "ut sacerdos "celebrans ac populus sacrificio assistens eumdem cruci- "fixum facile et commode intueri possint".[7] Again, there is an obvious difference between an image, or a relic of any kind exposed to public veneration, and the cross: otherwise no cross, fixed or moveable, should be allowed to surmount the tabernacle.

We conclude, therefore, that where necessity or notable

[1] Pars i. tit. xx.

[2] S. C. R., 16 June, 1663, *in Rossanen.*, ad 1. n. 2231. 17 Sept., 1822, ad 8. n. 4590. Benedict XIV., *Encyc. cit.*

[3] Pars. i. tit. xx. *Novæ observationes*, n. vi. in fine.

[4] Tom. iv. cap. xviii. *De cruce in altari*, etc., in Decr. ii.

[5] *Encyl. cit.* [6] *Annot. in Decr.*, 17 Sept., 1822, ad 8.

[7] Bened. XIV., *Encyl. cit.* in fine.

convenience requires it, the tabernacle may be surmounted by a crucifix distinct from, but resting on, the top, and large enough to satisfy the rubric of the missal. St. Charles clearly supposes that it may, at least in churches where the place occupied by the tabernacle is the only suitable place for the cross required by the missal: "In summo tabernaculo", he says, "sit imago "Christi gloriose resurgentis, vel sacra vulnera exhiben- "tis, vel si in altari exiguæ alicujus ecclesiæ per taberna- "culi occupationem congruus locus cruci (quæ alias super "eo collocaretur) esse non potest, ea pro alia sacra ima- "gine in tabernaculi summitate vel perpetuo affigatur, "vel processionum causa aliquando amovenda, decore "constituatur, affixa Christi crucifixi sacra effigie".[1]

608. What is said of the crucifix may be said also, and perhaps *a fortiori*, of the throne or the remonstrance used for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in the ceremony of benediction. This ceremony is now very frequent even in poor churches, and in many of these the top of the tabernacle is a flat surface, and is made to serve (the crucifix being removed for the time) as a throne for the remonstrance. It is true a different provision for the purpose can be made, and is made in many churches, but this one is so common and so convenient that it should not be condemned without an authoritative decision against it.

609. The door of the tabernacle should be large enough to allow the ciboriums to be put in and taken out easily. It may be highly ornamented, but the figures carved or painted on it should have reference to the

[1] Act. para. iv. l. c. pag. 472.

mystery of the Eucharist, or to the Passion or Resurrection, as *e.g.*, a representation of the chalice and host, a representation of our Lord crucified, or rising from the dead, or showing the wound in His sacred side, etc.[1]

It is strictly prohibited by a decree of the Sacred Congregation, to place a vase of flowers, or anything of the kind, immediately in front of the door.[2] It is also prohibited by another decree[3] to have the tabernacle so constructed or placed that the ciborium containing the Blessed Sacrament could be seen within it. If the door or sides be of precious stone that is transparent, it must be covered with the veil in such a way that the ciborium cannot be seen.

610. The veil which covers the exterior should be of precious material. It is usually of brocade or rich silk. It is used, according to St. Charles, not only for ornamenting the tabernacle, but also for protecting it from dust, and on more solemn occasions, if the pastor thinks proper, it may be removed altogether.[4] According to De Herdt,[5] the tabernacles in the churches of Belgium are rarely covered in this manner.

Where the Ambrosian rite is followed, as in Milan, the colour of the veil is red.[6] Elsewhere the colour should be that which is suited to the office of the day. This is, at least, the more common opinion. It is that of Gavan-

[1] St. Carol, l. c. p. 472. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 14. ii. 3°.
[2] 22 Jan., 1701, *in una Cong. Montis Coron.*, n. 3575.
[3] 20 Sept., 1806, *in Toletan*, ad. 2, n. 4505.
[4] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. *Instruct. variæ*, pag. 703.
[5] Loc. cit., 6°.
[6] Caval., vol. iv. cap. vi. *De Asserv. SS. Sacram.*, Decr. xiii. n. iii.

tus,[1] Cavalieri,[2] Bauldry,[3] De Herdt.[4] Baruffaldi insists, on the other hand, that it should be white, as white is the colour which properly belongs to the Blessed Sacrament.[5] This, however, must not be urged too far, for, as we shall see, the Sacred Congregation has decided that the colour of the stole used in administering the Eucharist should be that of the office of the day. Besides, the veil clearly belongs to the "paramenta altaris", which the rubric requires to be of the colour suited to the office of the day: **"Paramenta altaris, celebrantis et ministrorum debent "esse coloris convenientis officio et missæ diei"**, etc.[6]

An exception is made, however, when the office requires black. In this case Cavalieri says that the colour of the veil should be violet.[7] So also Gavantus.[8]

By a recent decree of the Congregation of Rites,[9] it has been decided that the opinion of Baruffaldi, as to the colour of the tabernacle veil, may be followed, although that of Gavantus is preferred, as having the usage of Rome in its favour. The "Melanges Theologiques"[10] suggests that in churches which do not provide veils of all the colours, there ought to be at least two white ones—one for ordinary use, and the other of richer material for the more solemn festivals.

611. In the decree above cited,[11] it is prescribed that the interior of the tabernacle be lined with silk. The

[1] Pars. i. tit. xx.
[2] Loc. cit., n. ii.
[3] Part iii. cap. 7. tit. xv. n. 1.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Tit. xxiii. n. 65.
[6] *Rub. Gen. Miss.*, xviii. n. i.
[7] Loc. cit. n. iii.
[8] Pars. i. tit. xx. V. *Tabernaculum.*
[9] 21 Jul., 1855, *in Brioccn*, ad 12, n. 5221.
[10] IV^me^ Serie, 8 Cahier, p. 364.
[11] Supra, n. 605

colour is not mentioned, but authors generally say it should be white, and the material very rich.[1] On the bottom of the tabernacle there should be spread a clean corporal, on which the ciborium may rest.[2] It would be desirable to have the corporal fitted to the shape of the tabernacle, and reserved for this purpose alone. But any corporal will do. Even a pall may be used, for the pall is regarded as a part of the corporal, the blessing for both being the same.[3]

612. The tabernacle must contain nothing else than the Holy Eucharist. It must be "ab omni alia re vacuum", according to our rubric. A decree of the Congregation of Bishops prohibits the holy oils, relics, or any thing else, however sacred, from being placed in it.[4] But according to Cavalieri,[5] this does not exclude the pyxis, or other sacred vessel destined to hold the Blessed Sacrament, though not actually containing it.

613. The tabernacle is blessed with the same form of benediction as that which is used for the pyxis.[6] Some deny that it requires to be blessed, as the "Melanges Theologiques",[7] and Cavalieri,[8] who observes that the word *vasculum*, in the prayer of the benediction, could not well

[1] De Herdt, l. c. 2°. *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars iv. *Instr. Fab. Eccl.* lib. i. cap. xiii. pag. 472.

[2] De Herdt, l. c. 7°. Mel. Theol. l. c.

[3] De Herdt, l. c. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 388.

[4] 8 Maii., 1698, apud. Caval., *De Asserv. SS. Sacramenti*, Decr. xiii.

[5] Loc. cit.

[6] Baruff., tit. lxviii. n. i. Catal., tit. viii. cap. xxv. n. iv. De Herdt, l. c. 8°.

[7] Loc. cit., pag. 365.

[8] Vol. iv. cap. xi. *De Benedict Sac. Sup.*, Decr. i. n. viii.

be applied to a large tabernacle. Most authors, however, maintain either that it should be blessed, or at least that it is laudable to have it blessed.[1] Cavalieri suggests that, if it be blessed, the word *tabernaculum*, be substituted for *vasculum* in the prayer, although in the end he admits that the words may be used as they are.[2]

614. Generally speaking, the tabernacle should be placed on the high altar, or principal altar of the church, as the place that is most conspicuous and best suited to the dignity of the Holy Sacrament. This is what the rubric here prescribes. In Cathedrals, however, the tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament should be placed on a side altar, because the ceremonies to be observed in pontifical functions at the high altar would be interfered with by those which reverence for the Blessed Sacrament would require at the same time. The question was formally decided by the Congregation of Bishops: "Tabernaculum SS. Sacramenti in Cathedralibus non debet "esse in altari majore, propter functiones Pontificales "quæ fiunt versis renibus ad altare; in parochialibus et "regularibus debet esse regulariter in altari majori tan- "quam digniori".[3] The Blessed Sacrament can be kept only on one altar, which, when there is any doubt, should be designated by the bishop, according to a decision of the Sacred Congregation.[4] Our rubric, as may be observed, does not fix on the high altar exclusively, but says, the high altar, or another altar that may be better accom-

[1] Vid. De Herdt, loc. cit. [2] Loc. cit., n. ix.

[3] Febr. 10, 1579, et Nov. 29, 1594, apud Caval., *De Asserv. SS. Sacram.*, Decr. xii.

[4] 21 Jul., 1696, *in Augusta Prætoriæ*, ad 3, n. 3392.

modated to the worship and veneration of the Holy Sacrament, so as not to interfere with the sacred functions. Hence when there is a tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament on an altar, at which one of these solemn functions is about to take place, the "Cæremoniale Episcopo-"rum" prescribes that the Blessed Sacrament be removed, for the time, to another altar.[1]

§ VII.—**Lampades coram eo plures, vel saltem una, die noctuque perpetuo colluceat; curabitque Parochus, ut omnia ad ipsius Sacramenti cultum ordinata, integra mundaque sint, et conserventur.**

615. At least one lamp should be kept constantly burning before the tabernacle. The rubric implies that it would be desirable to have more, but at least there should be one. It was usual to have lamps constantly burning in the churches from the very earliest times. It is certain that lights were used at the celebration of the sacred mysteries, not only in the catacombs and other dark places, but in the full light of day, and, therefore, not merely to dispel the darkness, but as a symbol of the light of Christ. In some churches they were kept constantly burning, and though it cannot be clearly proved, it is highly probable, that they were in most instances designed to honour the Blessed Sacrament.[2]

At all events, for several centuries, by a universal custom having the force of law, acknowledged and enforced by numberless decrees, there is an obligation of having a lamp constantly burning before it, as a mark of respect

[1] Vid. Lib. i. cap. xii. n. 8.

[2] Vid. Mel. Theol., IV^me^ Serie, 4^me^ Cahier, p. 501 et seq.

and reverence towards Him who is "the true light", and also as a sign to the faithful of the place where He is present.[1] The pastor or rector of the church is specially charged with this obligation; and, according to the common opinion, to leave the Blessed Sacrament through negligence for a notable time, as *e.g.* for an entire day, without a light before it, would be a mortal sin.[2]

The oil used should be oil of olives, but in places where it cannot easily be procured, other oil may be used.[3] A recent decree of the Congregation of Rites has decided the point, but requires that what is substituted be, if possible, a vegetable oil.[4]

616. This is the general law, which should be, as far as possible, strictly observed. The poverty of a parish is not admitted as a sufficient reason for a dispensation from it. It was decided that, in the case of a poor parish, one should be appointed to collect alms for the purpose,[5] or two or three such parishes, if near each other, should be made to contribute towards the lamp and the other requisites in one church selected by the bishop, in which the Blessed Sacrament might be reserved for the use of all.[6]

[1] Baruff., tit. xxiii. n. 69 et seq, S. R. C., 22 Aug., 1699, *in una Ord. Capuccin*, n. 3525. Cfr. Mel. Theol., l. c.

[2] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 14. iv. Busemb. apud St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 248.

[3] Baruff., n. 78. Caval., cap. vi. *De Asserv. SS. Sacram.*, Decr. xv. n. ii.

[4] 9 Jul., 1864, cit. apud "The Irish Ecclesiastical Record", No. ii. November, 1864.

[5] Cong. Epis. 14 Martii, 1614, et Congreg. Concil. 22 Martii, 1594, apud Falise, *Decret. Authen.*, etc. V. *De Asserv. SS. Euch.*, in nota.

[6] S. C. Conc. 17 Aug., 1697, apud Falise, loc. cit.

We believe there are few parishes in Ireland that could claim an exemption on the score of poverty, few in which, the faithful, if called on, would not readily contribute the necessary funds. The Synod of Thurles directs pastors to endeavour, as far as they can, to give the faithful an opportunity of visiting and adoring our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and with this view to leave the doors of their churches open, at least for some hours every day, where they can conveniently do so.[1] This may be easily done in towns, and wherever the priest lives near the church. Moreover, if a confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament were established in the parish, the members would provide every thing necessary for the tabernacle, lamp, etc. There are some churches, however, in which this could not well be done, and there are some also in which the lamp could not be kept burning during the night, without exposing the Blessed Sacrament to the danger of irreverence or even sacrilege. Hence the Synod of Thurles, in its decree on the subject, requires the lamp to be kept lighted during the night only in those churches where this can be done with safety.[2] A similar state of things exists in parts of Belgium, and is provided for in the same way.[3]

617. The priest is often permitted to keep the Blessed Sacrament in his house, and in some cases is not required to have a light before it.[4] There is no doubt, however, that it would be highly laudable in him to have the tabernacle, if possible, so placed that he could have a little

[1] *De Eucharistia*, n. 20.
[2] Ibid., n. 19.
[3] De Herdt, n. 14. iv.
[4] Synod. Thurl., loc. cit., n. 23.

lamp constantly burning before it. This would present no difficulty if he can afford to have a small oratory, or a room set apart for the purpose, as the Synod of Thurles recommends.[1]

It would seem from the first Synod of Westminster,[2] that in England permission is not given to keep the Blessed Sacrament any where without a light. It would be impossible to observe the same strictness in Ireland, where the priest is, in some places, so badly lodged. At the same time, no one doubts, that every priest who has permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in his house, should aim at providing, as far as circumstances permit, and on a scale commensurate with the place in which he keeps it, everything that the rubrics prescribe for its custody in parish churches.

§ VIII.—**Sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ particulas frequenter renovabit. Hostiæ vero, seu particulæ consecrandæ sint recentes, et ubi eas consecraverit, veteres primo distribuat, vel sumat.**

618. The rubric prescribes that the sacred species be frequently renewed, but it does not say how often, or does not exactly determine after what interval they ought to be renewed. Accordingly this interval has not been the same every where, but has been different in different places, having been determined by particular rituals or synodal statutes. It was pretty generally fixed at eight days, or at most fifteen days, being extended in only one or two instances to a month.[3]

[1] Loc. cit. [2] *De SS. Euch. Sacramento*, 6°.

[3] Cfr. Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. v. art. iii. n. ix.

619. St. Charles ordered the renewal at least every eight days,[1] and this interval is fixed by Gavantus,[2] and by the authority of two decrees—one of the Congregation of Bishops,[3] and the other of the Congregation of Rites.[4] The same is fixed also by the Synod of Thurles, which says, "Ne autem diutius asservatæ corrumpantur parti-"culæ, a parochis et aliis sacerdotibus ad quos spectat "renovandæ sunt octavo quolibet die".[5] In Ireland, therefore, there can be no doubt as to the time within which the particles ought to be renewed.

In Belgium, however, according to the "Melanges "Theologiques", even by recent statutes that have received the sanction of the Holy See, an interval of fifteen days is permitted, unless in case of rainy weather, or great damp, when the renewal is required to be more frequent.[6] Of course such a permission cannot be acted on in other places where it has not been given, especially seeing that in one of the decrees cited above, the Sacred Congregation expressly declares that the renewal of the particles should not be deferred for fifteen days.[7]

620. Speaking of the obligation generally, no one can have a doubt that it binds "*sub gravi*", since it is imposed by the Church in a matter that intimately concerns the honour and reverence due to our Lord in the Holy Sacrament.[8] But if it be asked what delay would amount

[1] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. iv. Instruct. Euch. § *De custodia*, pag. 424.
[2] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 5 lit. *t*.
[3] 5 April, 1573, apud Caval., *De Asserv. SS. Sacram.*, Decr, xvii.
[4] 3 Sept., 1672, *in Conchen*, n. 2602. [5] *De Eucharistia*, n. 17.
[6] IV^me^ Serie, 4^me^ Cahier, p. 527.
[7] 5 April, 1573, Vid. Decr. in Appendice.
[8] Cfr. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 30. i.

to a mortal sin, we should answer in accordance with the opinion of Romsée,[1] which is cited and adopted by De Herdt.[2] 1° To defer the renewal of the particles for fifteen days, would not, we think, exceed a venial sin, unless in case of great damp or some other cause that would accelerate the corruption. We say "*would not exceed a venial sin*", because, although, of course, it is no sin where this interval is permitted, as in Belgium, we would not say that to do so without cause is free from all sin where, as in Ireland, the renewal every eight days is prescribed by a synodal decree. But any reasonable cause would justify a delay of this renewal for a few days longer, *e.g.*, the convenience of having a number of communicants to whom the particles might be distributed, the convenience of using the same host for benediction during the nine days of a Novena, etc. In a word, we think it is plain from the Belgian statutes above referred to, that a delay, which does not put off the renewal for more than fifteen days, cannot be regarded as *per se* a "materia "gravis"; otherwise these statutes would not have been approved at Rome. Besides, Gardellini, or his continuator, commenting on the decree which prohibits the consecration of bread that has been made three months, takes occasion to observe regarding the renewal: "Quod "si ad quindecim dies protrahatur renovatio non id "reprobandum culpæque vertendum, quia hoc intra breve "tempus haud formido quod sacræ species corrumpantur".[3]

2° To defer the renewal for more than a month, above

[1] Tom. i. pars. i. cap. ii. art. xiv. n. 8. [2] Loc. cit.

[3] *Annot. in Decr.*, S. R. C., 16 Dec. 1826, *in Gandaven Quær*, i. ad 1 et 2, n. 4628.

all in damp weather, cannot be excused from mortal sin. This may be justly inferred from the decrees and declarations already cited. It may be added, that when the statutes of the Provincial Council of Mechlin, held in 1607, were submitted for approval at Rome, the words "*singulis mensibus renoventur*", which were in the statute regarding this subject, were struck out, and the words "*singulis saltem hebdomadis*", inserted in place of them.[1] It is no excuse, that the species might remain unaltered for even a much longer time than a month, for the law is founded on a general presumption of danger, and, therefore, does not cease to bind even in cases where it is known that no danger exists.[2] Besides, the object of the law is not only to guard against this danger, but to secure that reverence for the holy mystery, which is implied in the frequent renewal of the sacred species.[3]

621. The rubric requires that not only the consecrated particles be frequently renewed, but also, and for the same reason, that the particles to be consecrated shall have been recently made. But how recently it does not determine. It is certain from an answer of the Sacred Congregation,[4] that it is not lawful to consecrate particles that have been made three months, and the annotator holds that to act against this decree would be a grievous sin.[5] Within this limit nothing is strictly defined on the subject. St. Charles prescribes that the hosts to be consecrated be not

[1] Mel. Theol. l. c. p. 526.
[2] Suarez, *De Legibus*, lib. iii. cap. xxiii. n. 6.
[3] Mel. Theol., l. c. p. 528.
[4] 16 Decr., 1826, *in Gandav., Quær.* i. n. 4623.
[5] *Annotat. in Decr. cit.*

older than twenty days at most,[1] and we think it would be well to adopt this rule in practice. On the one hand, it would not be too difficult for the priest in any circumstances to get his supply of altar breads renewed every third week; and on the other, by doing so, and renewing the species every eight days, he would be pretty sure to guard against all danger of irreverence.[2]

622. When new hosts are consecrated, the old ones, according to the rubric, are to be distributed to the faithful who may be for communion at the time, or to be consumed by the priest himself. The ciborium, or pyxis, ought to be purified at the same time. The same reason which requires the renewal of the sacred species, holds also, as is plain, for the removal of the minute particles that may remain in the ciborium.

Various methods are suggested for purifying the ciborium, which is done by the priest at mass.

I. Having collected the fragments as carefully as possible, with the index finger of the right hand, he receives them by applying the finger to his tongue, or by bringing the fragments close to the edge, and then putting the ciborium to his mouth. He afterwards pours in some wine, which he makes pass round the interior with his index finger, and having received this, dries the ciborium with the purificator. This is the method of Gavantus,[3] but it is commonly rejected as inconvenient.

II. Having distributed the large particles or consumed

[1] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. iv. Instruc. Euch. § *De custodia SS. Eucharistiæ*, pag. 424.

[2] Cfr. Mel. Theol. l. c. pag. 530.

[3] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 7, lit. b.

them, he collects the fragments in the ciborium as above, and holding it with his left hand over the chalice, makes them fall into it with the index of his right; he then takes the wine for the first ablution in the ciborium, and having carefully passed it round the interior with his finger, he pours it into the chalice, after previously drying the finger. This is the method of Merati.[1]

III. In the preceding methods the priest is supposed to have received the Precious Blood, for he is supposed to distribute or to consume the larger particles before collecting the fragments in the ciborium. But some suggest that he should collect the fragments and allow them to fall into the chalice *before* he receives the Precious Blood, so that he may receive them along with it. This is the method of Quarti and Coninck, cited by the "Melanges "Theologiques",[2] and is there preferred to any other. We think this method, however, is liable to serious objections. In the first place, it cannot be adopted when the priest has to distribute or to consume any large particles before collecting the fragments, because the rubric of the Missal plainly requires that he should receive the Precious Blood before doing so, and the decree already cited still more clearly requires the same, since it says these particles are to be consumed: "post sumptionem sanguinis ante puri- "ficationem".[3] To meet this, it may be said that the priest could take out the larger particles and put them aside on the corporal, or in another ciborium, until he has received the Precious Blood. But this would be an additional trouble, and even still he would have to dispose

[1] In Gav. l. c. n. xxxii.
[2] Loc. cit. p. 534.
[3] 3 Sept., 1672, *in Conchen*, n. 2602.

of the minute fragments that might be left by those particles on the corporal or in the other ciborium. The method then could be adopted only in the case which is rather the exception than the rule, that is, when there are no large particles in the ciborium to be purified. Even in this case, though we would not condemn its adoption on account of the authority in favour of it, we would not recommend it, for we think it more in accordance with the rubric, that the priest should consummate the sacrifice by receiving the Precious Blood before receiving even the minute fragments that had been consecrated at another time.

IV. Having received the Precious Blood, and consumed or distributed the larger particles, he gets a little wine in the chalice, collects the fragments in the ciborium, and makes them fall into the chalice as above. He then gets wine in the ciborium, and after carefully passing it round the interior, pours it into the chalice; if he thinks it necessary, he may repeat this a second or a third time, or he may use his index finger in applying the wine to any part of the interior. He next dries the ciborium with a purificator, if he have new consecrated particles to be put into it, and having put them in, collects and puts into the chalice the fragments they may have left on the corporal. He then takes the contents of the chalice as the first ablution, and proceeds as usual. If he have no particles to put in, he need not dry the ciborium until after the second ablution, which, like the first, he may take in the ciborium, to be poured out of it into the chalice. In this case he first dries the chalice and then the ciborium.

623. We prefer this last mode to any other we have seen, and we know it is found in practice very convenient and very effective. It agrees in substance with that proposed by Merati, and putting together what De Herdt states on the subject,[1] we think it is the method recommended by him. But it has one suggestion that is not made by either, viz.: that a little wine be poured into the chalice before the fragments are made to fall into it. The object of this is to prevent the fragments from adhering to the bottom, or from being dispersed round the sides of the chalice by the wine that is afterwards poured in out of the ciborium.[2] Again, we think that, generally speaking, the wine poured into the ciborium may be made to pass over the whole interior surface, and take up the minute particles, without applying the finger, and hence we have said, *if he thinks it necessary*. But if he uses the finger, he should dry it with the purificator before emptying the ciborium into the chalice, otherwise a drop from it may fall on the altar cloth or on the corporal.

624. M. Caron[3] observes, that very often the ciborium may be purified sufficiently well with the finger, without pouring in wine, if only a little more time and pains be taken. Any one who makes the trial will find that this is so, and when newly-consecrated particles are to be put into the ciborium immediately after it is purified, it is a great matter to be able to do without pouring in wine, as it is difficult to dry the interior so perfectly as to prevent the danger of particles adhering to it.

[1] Pars. ii. n. 30. iv.

[2] Cfr. Vavasseur, part. iv. sect. i. chap. ii. art. i., *Manière de donner la Sainte Communion*, n. 121, in nota.

[3] *Les Ceremonies de la Messe Basse*, art. xiv. § i. n. 129 *note*.

§ IX.—**Fideles omnes ad sacram Communionem admittendi sunt, exceptis iis qui justa ratione prohibentur. Arcendi autem sunt publice indigni, quales sunt excommunicati, interdicti, manifesteque infames, ut meretrices, concubinarii, fœneratores, magi, sortilegi, blasphemi, et alii ejus generis publici peccatores, nisi de eorum pœnitentia et emendatione constet, et publico scandalo prius satisfecerint.**

625. According to this rubric, all the faithful have a right to be admitted to Holy Communion, except such as are for just reasons excluded. It is the common opinion of theologians, that the pastor is bound to give communion to the members of his flock, not only when the precept of receiving it actually urges, but as often as they reasonably ask for it, "quoties rationabiliter et opportune "petunt".[1] It is for the pastor himself to judge when the demand is reasonable, taking all the circumstances into account, the condition of the person, the preparation required, etc.

626. It may be laid down as a general rule, that when a priest administers communion in public, he should administer it to all who present themselves to receive it. But there are some to whom, even in these circumstances, it is to be refused. Such are those whom the rubric here points out—those, namely, who are *publicly known to be unworthy*. They are not to be admitted to Holy Communion in any circumstances, until they have given proof of their repentance and amendment. They have no claim to be admitted. By their exclusion they are merely prevented from consummating an act of sacrilege; and even

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 258.

their reputation cannot suffer, since they are, by supposition, public sinners; and on the other hand, great scandal would arise from admitting them. The priest, therefore, is bound to exclude them. According to some theologians, he might administer the sacrament to save his own life, provided he were not required to do so in contempt of religion. St. Liguori for a time thought this opinion probable, but he afterwards rejected it, and maintains that the priest must refuse the sacrament to the notoriously unworthy, at the risk of his life, even when contempt is not intended.[1]

627. The chief difficulty here is in determining what kind of publicity is required in order that a person be a "public sinner" in the sense of the rubric. According to the usual distinction of theologians and canonists, a crime may be public in three ways. 1° By publicity "of law" (*publicitate juris*)—when a person juridically accused of any crime, confesses it, or is convicted of it. 2° By publicity "of fact" (*publicitate facti*)—when the crime has been committed before so many, that no subterfuge or evasion can conceal it. 3° By publicity "of fame" (*publicitate famæ*)—when the crime is already known to the greater part of any community, or to so many that it is morally certain to come to the knowledge of the community.[2] Various rules are given as to the number who should know it, according to the different communities, of which there may be question. We need not seek for mathematical accuracy in a matter of this kind, and Carriere concludes that a crime may be looked on as

[1] Lib. vi. n. 49, Dub. 5.

[2] Vid. Carriere, *De Justitia et Jure*, n. 891.

public in any community when, considering the crime itself, the persons to whom it is known, and the community of which there is question, the knowledge of it is morally certain to spread.[1]

In practice, therefore, the priest in his parish or district, must take all the circumstances into account, and decide according to the best of his judgment. If, all things considered, a doubt still remains as to whether a crime has been committed, communion is not to be refused.[2] It is a well-known principle of canon law, that one is presumed to be innocent unless he is proved to be guilty, "Nemo "præsumitur malus, nisi probetur malus".[3] When the doubt regards, not the commission, but the publicity, of a crime, the sacrament should not be refused in public, according to Lacroix.[4] In truth, the reasons to be presently stated, why the sacrament is not to be refused in public to an occult sinner, may be applied with almost equal force here.

628. With regard to the proof of amendment that is to be required, it is enough if it be publicly known that the person has gone to confession, has abandoned the occasion of sin, has made restitution or satisfaction where due, etc. Here also much must be left to the prudent judgment of the priest. But it may be observed, that if a person has been living in the occasion of sin, theologians insist that he shall have actually given up the occasion, no other

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 48. Lacroix, lib. vi. pars. i. n. 142.

[3] C. *Mandata*, 6 apud Reiffenst. lib. ii. *Decretal*, tit. xxiii. *De Præsumptionibus*, n. 42.

[4] Loc. cit.

proof of amendment can be accepted.[1] In doubt about the amendment, the sacrament is to be refused, for the crime being once certain, the amendment must be clearly proved.[2]

629. If one who has been a public sinner has amended and done penance in private, he may be admitted to Holy Communion in private.[3] This, however, must be understood of one who is prepared to make public reparation as soon as he can, but may be unable for a time; otherwise it is plain he would not have the requisite dispositions.[4]

§ X.—**Occultos vero peccatores, si occulte petant, et non eos emendatos agnoverit, repellat, non autem si publice petant, et sine scandalo ipsos præterire nequeat.**

630. By "occult sinners", are here understood those whose sins are not public in any of the ways above explained.[5] If one of these asks for Holy Communion in private, the priest should refuse. We suppose, of course, that the priest has certain knowledge that the person has been guilty of grievous sin, and has no evidence of his repentance. The reason is obvious. The priest, as a general rule, is bound not to administer the sacrament to one whom he knows to be unworthy, according to the words of our Lord: "Nolite dare sanctum canibus".[6] In the present case he prevents an act of sacrilege, and does not even hurt the person's character.

[1] St. Lig., n. 47. Lacroix, l. c. n. 141.
[2] St. Lig., n. 48.
[3] St. Lig., n. 47.
[4] Cfr. Bouvier, *Tract. de Decal.*, cap. i. art. iii. § iii. punct. ii. in fine.
[5] Supra, n. 627.
[6] Matt. vii, 6. Vid. St. Lig., n. 48.

631. If the priest has his knowledge only through the confessional, he cannot make use of it, he cannot allow it to influence his conduct in any way towards the penitent. He cannot admonish him, or refuse him communion on some other pretext however specious; in a word, outside the confessional he must treat him exactly as he would, *if that knowledge did not exist.* If he knows it from another source as well as from the confessional, his knowledge from that other source must be morally certain, otherwise he cannot act on it.[1] If the knowledge be derived from the confession, not of the person who asks for communion, but of another, the confessor cannot directly use the knowledge without the express permission of that other. He may use it so far as to ask some general questions regarding the preparation made, etc., just as he might use it in interrogations in the confessional. Great prudence and caution, however, are necessary in this case. Better tolerate the sacrilege than expose one's self to the least danger of breaking the seal of confession.[2]

632. If an occult sinner presents himself for Holy Communion in public, so that he cannot be passed over without the circumstance being observed by others, and, therefore, without scandal, the rubric here directs, and theologians are unanimous in teaching, that the sacrament is to be administered to him. One reason commonly assigned is, the injury which his character would otherwise suffer. This reason of itself would scarcely suffice, for it is hard to believe that we are bound to consult for the reverence due to our Lord in the sacrament, less than

[1] St. Lig, lib. vi. n. 50 in fine, n. 51, et n. 658.
[2] Vid. St. Lig., n. 631, *Si autem.*

for the character of a wretch who would outrage Him by an unworthy communion. But very serious evils might follow from allowing the priest to refuse communion in public to one whose unworthiness he knows only by private information. A power of this kind would be liable to great abuse. The priest, after all, is but a man, liable to be deceived, to be influenced by passion, prejudice, ill will, etc., and thus, under the plea of private knowledge, he might publicly refuse the sacrament to those who are really worthy. The fear of being thus excluded, might deter many from approaching, and great spiritual injury would result. Again, the obligation of discriminating, weighing the evidence, etc., would be an almost intolerable onus on the priest, and a source of endless scruples and anxieties.

It is for these reasons chiefly, according to St. Liguori,[1] and not merely to save the character of the occult sinner, that our Lord has been pleased to yield His right, and allow His sacred body to be profaned by the unworthy communicant, as it was by Judas, to whom He Himself administered the Eucharist at the Last Supper. If the priest, by private remonstrance, or by a general exhortation before administering communion, can prevent such a one from approaching, he ought to do so, but he cannot go beyond this.[2]

It is not permitted to administer in such circumstances an unconsecrated particle, for although this might prevent the sacrilege, it would be the cause of material idolatry.[3]

[1] Loc. cit. n. 49, in fine, et n. 50.

[2] Bened. XIV., *Syn. Dioc.* lib. vii. cap. xi. n. 4.

[3] St. Lig., n. 59–61. De Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, Disp. viii. n. 187.

633. If a person be guilty of a crime which is not public where he presents himself for communion, though it is public in another place, it is a disputed question whether he is to be regarded as an occult, or as a public sinner. Many hold that he should be regarded as a public sinner, and be refused the sacrament. St. Liguori, however, holds that he is to be treated as an occult sinner, unless when it is certain that his crime will soon be known in the place where he is.[1]

634. A person might, through mere ignorance or simplicity, go to receive communion with others, though not prepared, *e.g.*, without having gone to confession, though conscious of grievous sin; and we may conceive circumstances in which the priest could without any danger of scandal, pass by such a one, or gently convey to him, that he should withdraw.

If the priest be in any case perfectly certain that he can do so, we see no reason why he should not, for the rubric here directs communion to be given to the occult sinner who presents himself in public, only in case he cannot be passed over without scandal. The case is a rare one, no doubt, but we have been told that it has occurred sometimes at stations for confession in remote country districts, where communion is given at intervals during the day.

§ XI.—**Amentibus præterea seu phreneticis communicare non licet: licebit tamen, si quando habeant lucida intervalla, et devotionem ostendant, dum in eo statu manent, si nullum indignitatis periculum adsit.**

635. Communion is not to be given in any circum-

[1] Lib. vi. n. 46.

stances to those who are insane, and who have never had the use of reason.[1] If they have lucid intervals, and if during these intervals they desire communion, there is no reason why it may not then be administered to them, since by supposition they have the use of reason, and may. therefore, be disposed like any of the other faithful. But if, after such a lucid interval in which a desire of communion is expressed, the insanity returns before the sacrament is administered, can it still be administered, provided there be no danger of irreverence? The words of the present rubric leave its meaning somewhat ambiguous; but all doubt as to what should be done in practice, is removed by the common teaching of theologians, that communion can be given to the actually insane only "in articulo "mortis".[2] The Catechism of the Council of Trent says: "To persons labouring under insanity, and at the time in- "capable of sentiments of piety, the sacrament is on no "account to be given. If, however, before they became "insane, they evinced pious and religious sentiments, they, "according to the decree of the Council of Carthage, may "be admitted to its participation at the close of life, "provided there be no danger to be apprehended of dis- "charging the stomach, or of other indignity and incon- "venience".[3]

636. Those who are not quite bereft of reason, but whose reason is feeble, who are simpletons or half-fools, should be admitted to communion when the precept urges, as well as "in articulo mortis", provided they have sufficient in-

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 302.
[2] St. Lig., n. 302 in fine.
[3] Pars. ii. cap. vi. n. 64.

telligence to distinguish it from ordinary food, but not oftener.[1]

§ XII.—**Ita etiam, iis qui propter ætatis imbecillitatem nondum hujus Sacramenti cognitionem et gustum habent, administrari non debet.**

637. According to the usage which prevailed in the early ages of the Church, the Eucharist was administered to infants, immediately after baptism, and frequently besides before they attained the use of reason.[2] There is no doubt that they are capable of receiving it, and that it would confer on them an increase of grace; and the same is true of baptized adults, who have never had the use of reason.[3] This custom was gradually given up, and for more than five centuries has ceased in the Latin Church, although it still exists to some extent in the Greek Church.[4]

638. According to the present law which is expressed in this rubric, communion is not to be administered to children who have not yet attained the use of reason, for till then it is plain they cannot have a sufficient knowledge of this divine sacrament. They would seem to be bound by the precept of communion, as expressed in the decree of Lateran "*Omnis utriusque*",[5] as soon as they attain the use of reason. The words "*postquam ad* "*annos discretionis pervenerit*", are understood to impose

[1] St. Lig., n. 303.

[2] Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. i. art. xv. n. xi. xii. Bened. XIV. *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. xii. n. 1.

[3] St. Lig., n. 301. Vid. De Lugo, *De Eucharistia*, Disp. xiii. sect. ii.

[4] Bened. XIV., l. c.

[5] Infra, chap. xiii. § i.

the obligation of confession on those who are capable of committing mortal sin. "It may be laid down as a general "principle", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that children are bound to go to confession as soon as "they are able to discern good from evil, and are capable "of malice".[1] Now the words of the canon evidently apply to communion as well as to confession. Hence St. Antoninus and other theologians, cited by St. Liguori,[2] maintain that children are bound by both precepts at the same age, though the communion may be deferred for some time, as the decree itself expressly permits, if the confessor judges it expedient. This view is strongly urged by a writer in the "Analecta Juris Pontificii".[3]

But the more probable opinion, and that which agrees best with the practice of the Church, does not bind them to communion as early as they are bound by the precept of confession, but gives them a longer time to prepare, and would thus interpret the "annos discretionis" for communion as later than the "annos discretionis" for confession.[4]

639. No precise age is fixed for the obligation, but it is laid down as a general rule that children are not bound before the age of nine or ten, and that their communion should not be deferred beyond the age of twelve, or at most fourteen. It is said "*as a general rule*", for some may show so much intelligence, and be so well instructed, as to be bound, or at least to be admissible, at an earlier age, and, therefore, those pastors are reprehensible who

[1] Pars. ii. cap. v. n. 44. [2] Loc. cit.

[3] V^me^ Serie, pag. 352., *Communion des enfans.*

[4] St. Lig., n. 301, *Secunda sententiæ.* Billuart, *De Eucharistia*, Dissert. vi. art. i. § iii.

refuse communion indiscriminately to all children under a certain age.[1] "The age at which children should be "admitted to communion", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "no one can better determine than the "father and confessor, for it is theirs to examine and to "inquire from the children whether they have acquired "any knowledge of, and experience a relish for, this ad- "mirable sacrament".[2]

640. There is no doubt, however, that in danger of death, the Eucharist is to be administered to children who have attained the use of reason, though they may not yet have reached the age at which they would, in the ordinary course, make their first communion.[3] They are bound by divine precept to receive the viaticum if they have sense enough to distinguish the Eucharist from other food.[4] According to Benedict XIV., it is to be administered to children in danger of death, if they have sufficient maturity of judgment to distinguish it from common and material food—or, as he afterwards expresses it, if they have sufficient intelligence to believe and adore our Lord under the sacramental species. The bishop, he says, may compel pastors to administer it to them. . . . "si "eos compererint tantam assecutos judicii maturitatem ut "cibum istum cœlestem et supernum a communi et mate- "riali discernant";[5] or to those . . . "quos iidem "parochi, diligenti præmisso examine, tantâ compererint "pollere ingenii perspicaciâ ut latentem sub speciebus, sa-

[1] St. Lig., ibid. *Sed hic dubitatur.* Vid. Benedict XIV., *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. xii. n. 2.

[2] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 68.

[3] Bened. XIV., l. c. n. 3. De Lugo, Disp. xiii. sect. iv. n. 37. St. Lig., l. c. Dub. 2 in fine.

[4] De Lugo, loc. cit. n. 39.

[5] Loc. cit. n. 1.

"cramentalibus Christum et firmiter credant et reverenter "adorent".[1]

641. By comparing these two sentences, it may be seen that, in the mind of Benedict XIV., to distinguish the Eucharist from common food, is to believe in the real presence of our Lord, and adore Him under the sacramental species. De Lugo[2] also conveys clearly enough, that this is the sense in which he uses the expression; and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in the passage already cited,[3] plainly teaches that this is the sense in which the expression ought to be understood. In doubt about the capacity of a child, theologians are not agreed as to whether the viaticum should be administered or withheld. De Lugo thinks it may be administered, but that there is no obligation of administering it.[4] Bouvier would be in favour of administering it.[5]

642. There is no more important duty of the pastor than that of preparing the children of his parish for their first communion. A fervent first communion is often followed by frequent participation of the sacraments and a steady perseverance in virtue; while, on the other hand, it is hardly possible that those who do not receive communion till long after the age when the passions are fully developed, or who receive it without due preparation, should persevere amidst the temptations to which youth is exposed.[6] The Council of Trent teaches that this spiritual food is given to us "as an antidote, whereby we may

[1] Loc. cit. n. 3.
[2] Loc. cit. n. 26.
[3] Supra, n. 579.
[4] Loc. cit. n. 43, 44.
[5] *De Eucharistia*, cap. vi. art. i. Notanda circa Viaticum, n. 2°.
[6] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 193.

"be freed from daily faults, and be preserved from mortal "sins".[1] Hence there are numberless decrees of provincial and diocesan synods, in which the attention of pastors is specially directed to this important duty. The "Me- "langes Theologiques"[2] cites several decrees of synods held in France and Belgium; and a decree of the Synod of Thurles also directs special attention to it.[3]

643. We have already seen that the age at which children may be admitted to first communion is not fixed, and depends very much on the degree of intelligence and the state of preparation shown in each case.[4] But at least it is certain that no child who has attained the use of reason should be excluded from the preparatory instructions. The time and manner of giving these instructions must depend, to some extent, on local circumstances. The Synod of Thurles[5] directs that some days be devoted to them every year during the summer season. In the country parishes of Ireland, the children could hardly attend at any other time, on account of the distance of many of them from the church and the general severity of the weather.

644. There ought to be in every parish a confraternity of the Christian doctrine, the members of which are charged with the duty of catechizing children. This confraternity is earnestly recommended to the bishops of the Church by Pope Innocent XI. in an encyclical letter, 16 Junii, 1686. It is enriched with many indulgences;

[1] Sess. xiii. cap. ii. Waterworth's translation.

[2] I^re Serie, 3^me Cahier, p. 293 et seq. et II^me Serie 2^me Cahier, p. 266 et seq.

[3] *De Eucharistia*, n. 22.

[4] Supra, n. 639.

[5] Loc. cit.

and special facilities are granted for its establishment in every parochial church.[1] Such a confraternity, properly organized and directed, would lighten very much the labour of the priest, and enable him, without much difficulty, to ascertain those who might be admitted to first communion. It would be easy to form these into a separate class, or into two or more classes, according to their degrees of proficiency. Select members of the confraternity could be charged with the care of these classes, and a few instructions from the priest would then suffice to complete the preparation of the more advanced. It is only by adopting some such plan that the priest, in a populous parish, can at all perform the duty.

645. It is well to give as much solemnity as possible to the ceremony of first communion. This exterior solemnity is not only a help to devotion at the time, but serves to fix the event in the memory; and there can be no doubt that the remembrance of the day of one's first communion often produces a most salutary effect in after life. The Synod of Thurles expressly directs[2] that the mass at which first communion is administered, be celebrated with the greatest possible solemnity.

It must, of course, be left to the zeal and prudence of the pastor, to regulate the details according to circumstances. The decorations of the altar, the vestments, the number of lights, etc., etc., may be such as are used on great festivals. The communicants should be dressed in their best attire. In many places, according to a laudable custom, the female children are dressed in white. Provi-

[1] Vid. Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, II^me^ Partie, chap. i. art. ii. § i. *except.* 2°.

[2] Loc. cit.

sion must be made also for carrying out the separation of the sexes prescribed in a preceding rubric.[1]

646. The first communion of children is usually fixed to take place within the Paschal time. Though many of them, according to what has been said,[2] may not in strictness be bound by the Paschal precept, there is always a considerable number who are so bound, and who have thus an opportunity of complying with the obligation. Hence in many of those synods cited by the "Melanges "Theologiques",[3] it is expressly directed that the first communion should take place in Paschal time.

When this first communion is at the same time the fulfilment of the Paschal precept, it can be administered only by the parish priest, or with his consent.[4] In some of the statutes referred to, as *e.g.*, those of Ghent,[5] it is forbidden, in general terms and without any limitation, to admit a child to first communion without the leave of the parish priest or the ordinary. In dioceses where such regulations exist, they should, of course, be observed. But, according to the common usage at present, the leave of the parish priest or ordinary is not required for first communion, or for any other, unless it be the Paschal communion, or the viaticum.[6]

[1] Supra, n. 591.
[2] Supra. n. 638.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Vid. infra, chap. xiii. § i.
[5] Apud Melanges Theol., II^me^ Serie, p. 267.
[6] Vid. St. Lig., n. 235-236.

CHAPTER XII.

ORDER OF ADMINISTERING HOLY COMMUNION.

ORDO ADMINISTRANDI SACRAM COMMUNIONEM.

§ I.—Sacerdos igitur Sanctissimam Eucharistiam ministraturus, Hostiis, seu Particulis pro populi multitudine consecratis, vasculoque, uno vel pluribus, decenti et commodo loco expositis, cum vino et aqua ad purificationem eorum qui Communionem sumpserint, et ante eos linteo mundo extenso, lotis prius manibus, et Superpelliceo indutus, ac desuper stola coloris Officio illius diei convenientis, præcedente Clerico seu alio ministro, procedit ad Altare manibus junctis, et accensis cereis, facta prius et postea genuflexione, extrahit pyxidem, et illam super corporale depositam discooperit.

647. Priests alone are the ordinary ministers of the Eucharist. According to the ancient discipline of the Church, and while holy communion was administered under both species, deacons also acted as ministers, and they are in fact by their ordination, "comministri et "cooperatores corporis et sanguinis Domini".[1] They usually assisted the bishop or priest, who administered the host, while they immediately after presented the chalice; but they sometimes administered both.[2]

According to the present discipline, deacons can admi-

[1] Pontif. Rom. *De Ord. Diaconi.*

[2] Catal., tit. iv. cap. ii. § i. n. vii. viii.

nister the Eucharist only in case of necessity.[1] They may be commissioned to do so by the bishop or parish priest, when no priest can be conveniently had; or, if there be question of the viaticum, they can administer it in the absence of a priest, without any commission.[2] These cases, however, must be of rare occurrence, for, as De Lugo observes,[3] a deacon is seldom found where there is no priest.

648. When the sacrament is about to be administered, care must be taken in the first place that there be a sufficient number of consecrated particles for all who are to communicate. The particles should be round, not square, or of any other shape.[4] There is a very convenient instrument by which they are cut at once to the proper form, and which no sacristy should be without. It is a useful precaution after cutting them, to shake them gently on a piece of linen or white paper, so as to free them from the minute fragments that often adhere loosely to the edges. De Herdt[5] recommends the use of a sieve or some other such instrument for the purpose.

649. The rubric here directs that there be prepared in a convenient place, one or more vessels containing wine and water for the purification of the communicants. The rubric of the missal also directs how the purification is to be administered to those who receive communion "intra missam": "**Minister autem dextra manu tenens**

[1] Sac. Rit. Cong. 25 Febr. 1777, *in Ord. Min. Observ.*, n. 4379.
[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n, 237. De Lugo, disp. xviii. sec. i. n. 27.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] St. Lig., n. 205. De Herdt, pars. iii. n. 4. i. Cfr. Synod. Thurl., *De Euch.*, n. 32.
[5] Pars ii. n. 30, iv. in fine.

"vas cum vino et aqua, sinistra vero mappulam ali-
"quanto post Sacerdotem eis porrigit purificationem et
"mappulam ad os abstergendum".

We have seen, above, the instructions of St. Charles regarding this purification.[1] Baruffaldi also[2] supposes that it takes place, and observes that there should be two vessels, one of water, the other of wine, so that the communicants may have a choice, as some of them might not wish to take wine. Benedict XIV. supposes the same, and shows that it was introduced to enable the communicant more easily and more effectually to swallow the least fragment of the Sacred Host that might remain in the mouth, and not, as was maintained by De Vert, by way of substitute for the chalice when it was withdrawn.[4]

650. There are few places, however, in which it has not completely fallen into disuse. De Herdt testifies for Belgium. Citing Jansens, he says, it has been given up for many just reasons—the danger of effusion, the poverty of the churches, the difficulty of presenting it to each when there is a crowd of communicants, the nausea some would feel, etc., etc.[5] M. Caron testifies the same for France;[6] and it is entirely unknown in Ireland, England, and America. Merati, in his commentary on the rubric of the missal above cited, states that the custom is observed only in some churches.[7] It would seem from a note in the "Cérémonial des Evêques Expliqué", that at pre-

[1] *Rit. Cel. Miss.*, tit. x. n. 6 in fine. [2] Supra, n. 593.
[3] Tit. xxiv. n. 13 et seq.
[4] *De Sacrif. Miss.*, lib. ii. cap. xxii. 4, 5.
[5] Pars. ii. n. 28, i. in fine.
[6] *Ceremonies de La Messe Basse*, art. xiv. n. 137.
[7] *Nov. Obs. et Addit.*, etc. n. xxxiv.

sent the custom is not observed even in Rome,[1] and the same may be inferred from the fact that Baldeschi, in his instructions on the ceremonies to be observed in administering communion,[2] is entirely silent on the subject. The only case in which the rubric is generally observed now is at the communion of a mass of ordination. The purification is then presented immediately after communion to those who have received orders.

There is nothing, it must be confessed, in the wording of the rubric, to imply that it is not as binding as any other, nor can it be maintained that a contrary custom suffices of itself to remove the obligation of a rubric.[3] Yet it seems as if an exception must be admitted in regard to the present rubric. It is hard to conceive that the contrary custom could have prevailed, as it has prevailed, without at least that constructive consent of the legislator, which would suffice to remove the obligation.[4] In fact, this consent appears to be implied in a recent answer of the Sacred Congregation.[5] Being asked whether it would be expedient to introduce into the diocese of Luçon, the observance, at least at the communion of the clergy, of what is prescribed in the rubrics regarding the purification, the Sacred Congregation answered so as to allow the existing usage, according to which there was no purification, to be retained.[6] At all events, the reasons above mentioned by De Herdt, show that it would be inexpe-

[1] Lib. ii. cap. xxix. n. 3, note (3).
[2] *Esposizione Delle Sacre Ceremonie, etc.*, parte I[a] capo iii.
[3] Vid. chap. i. n. 55 et seq.
[4] Chap. i. n. 51, 52.
[5] 12 Aug. 1854, *in Lucionen*, ad 20 et ad 24.
[6] Vid. Decr. in Appendice.

dient to revive its observance where it has already fallen into disuse.[1]

651. The linen cloth which the rubric here directs to be extended before the communicants, is for the purpose of receiving any particle or fragment which might accidentally fall while the priest is administering the sacrament.[2] It is usually attached to the altar rails, and is held by the communicant in both hands, while the priest puts the Sacred Host into his mouth. It is evident from the purpose for which it is intended, that it should be held extended horizontally under the chin. St. Charles in his instructions directs that it be held, not by the communicant, but by two clerics, and held so that it may extend under the ciborium and the priest's hands, as well as under the chin of the communicant.[3] There is certainly good reason for this precaution, for particles may easily fall outside the communion cloth when it does not extend under the pyxis.

But as it is unusual for clerics to hold the cloth unless for the communion of the clergy, other expedients have been suggested. One is to hold the patena between the index and middle finger of the left hand which holds the ciborium. This is recommended by Possevin and Corsetti.[4] But the Sacred Congregation being consulted on the subject, forbade this use of the patena.[5] It allows a priest, however, to hold it under the

[1] Vid. Mel. Theol. VI^me^ Serie 4^me^ Cahier, pp. 544 et seq.
[2] Baruff., tit. xxiv. n. 16. Catal., cap. ii. § i. n. iii.
[3] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. iv. *Instr. de Sac. Com.*, p. 606.
[4] Apud. Mel. Theol., l. c. p. 532.
[5] 12 Aug. 1854, *in Lucionen*, ad 21.

chin at a general communion given by dignitaries.[1] Merati would permit it to be held in like manner by the deacon when communion is given at solemn mass.[2] Cavalieri disapproves of this opinion of Merati, and would confine the use of the patena strictly to a general communion administered by a dignitary, as *e.g.*, on a great festival in cathedral or collegiate churches, where both clergy and laity communicate.[3] The Sacred Congregation having been consulted, decided that the opinion of Merati may be followed.[4] It also sanctions the use of a silver plate or dish placed on the communion cloth at the grating in giving communion to nuns.[5]

Quarti recommends the priest to hold the ciborium itself under the chin of the communicant,[6] but this would be to avoid one danger by incurring another and a greater one, for the particles would be thus exposed to the breath of the person receiving. Besides, as is observed by the "Melanges Theologiques",[7] it would be hardly possible to hold the ciborium in this way on account of its shape and the usual position of the communicant.

652. We must, then, be satisfied in ordinary cases with the provisions of the rubric; and it is for the priest to take care that they be carried out, so as to guard, as far as possible, against the danger of allowing the minutest fragment to fall on the ground. This is, in substance, what the Sacred Congregation tells us in answer to a question on the subject.[8] The communicants, then,

[1] 3 Sept. 1661, *in Andrien*, n. 2127.
[2] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. liv.
[3] Cap. iv. *De. Comm. Fidel.*, Decr. viii. n. i.
[4] 12 Aug. 1854, *in Lucionen*, ad 20.
[5] Decr. cit., ad 23.
[6] Cit. apud. Caval., l. c. n. ii.
[7] Loc. cit. pag. 533.
[8] Decr. citat., ad. 22.

should be instructed to keep the cloth properly extended, and the priest should be careful, in administering each particle, to adopt the precautions recommended below.[1]

653. With all these, however, it may still happen that a whole particle, or a minute fragment will fall on the floor or on the dress of one of the communicants. The rubric of the missal provides for the case in which it falls on the floor. It is to be reverently taken up, and the place where it fell to be washed and scraped a little: what is thus scraped off being afterwards thrown into the sacrarium.[2] Collet[3] observes that the place where it fell should be marked and covered with something clean, that it may not be trodden on until it can be scraped as directed.[4] The rubric[5] also prescribes that, if it falls outside the corporal, on the altar cloth, or any other linen, the linen should be carefully washed, and the water thrown into the sacrarium. If, therefore, the priest, in giving communion, observes that any fragment has fallen on the cloth, he should immediately take it up, and, at the same time, note as well as he can, the spot where it fell, so that it may be washed as the rubric directs.[6]

654. Should a particle fall on the dress of one of the communicants, the priest ought at once to take it up; but should it fall inside the dress of a female, he ought to direct herself to take it up.[7] He must take care, however, to avoid anything that would excite disturbance or

[1] Vid. infra, § vii.

[2] Pars. iii. tit. x. rub. 15. *De Defectibus.*

[3] *Traité des Saints Mystères*, chap. xiv. n. 15.

[4] Cfr. Lig., lib. vi. n. 250. [5] Loc. cit. [6] Collet, l. c.

[7] St. Lig., l. c. Collet, *Traité des Saints Mystères*, l. c., et *De Eucharistia*, cap. v. in fine Quær. 6.

alarm. If the particle cannot easily be found, or if it be a minute fragment that is not easily seen, he may direct the person to withdraw quietly to the sacristy, or some other private place, and search for it, and having found it, either consume it or bring it to the church. These are the instructions of Collet,[1] who discusses several cases that may arise.

655. He observes that if the priest alone notices the fall of a minute fragment, and has reason to think that the search would be fruitless, or would be, in the circumstances, attended with very great inconvenience, he may be silent about the matter, and leave all to providence. It may be added that there is nearly always reason to apprehend such inconvenience when there is a great number of communicants, and, therefore, in such circumstances it is better, at least as a general rule, not to call attention to the matter. It is evident that in neglecting what is prescribed by the rubric of the missal above cited,[2] there is risk of leaving a minute fragment to be trampled on the floor. Yet, St. Liguori,[3] speaking of this rubric, says that it does not bind *sub gravi:* and also that, as a general rule, the washing of the dress or beard (on which a particle might have fallen) may be omitted, "ad evitandam turbationem populi".

In fact, the loss of minute fragments in this way, as well as of others that fall unobserved by any one, when there is a great number of communicants, may be looked on as an unavoidable accessory of the mystery itself: and, therefore, one should not be over anxious about the matter when he has taken the ordinary precautions against irre-

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Supra, n. 653. [3] Lib. vi. n. 250.

verence. The objections of the heretics to the doctrine of the real presence, founded on the supposed indignity to our Lord in this and other like cases, are refuted by Bellarmine.[1]

656. When there are only a few to receive communion, there is less danger that a particle or fragment may fall. In this case the cloth used is commonly a short one, presented by the clerk to the first of the communicants, and given by him to the next, and so on. A piece of card-board, covered with linen, somewhat like the pall,[2] but much larger, is sometimes used for the purpose, and is found very convenient. It is recommended by Cavalieri,[3] in his commentary on a decree of the Apostolic Visitation, which expressly prohibits the use of the chalice veil, or finger towel as a communion cloth. The same decree is cited by Merati.[4] It is not right to use the purificator,[5] or any part of the priest's vestments, as *e.g.*, the extremity of the surplice, chasuble, stole, etc.[6] In a word, the cloth used should be appropriated to that use exclusively, as is ordered by the decree of the Apostolic Visitation just cited.

657. The priest should wash his hands as directed by the rubric, even though they be perfectly clean, because the words make no exception, and because the washing of the hands here, as well as that which is prescribed before mass, has a mystic meaning, being suggestive of

[1] *De Eucharistia*, lib. iii. cap. x.

[2] Vid. Vavasseur, part. i. sec. iii. chap. iii. art. i. *Des Linges Sacrés* in nota.

[3] Cap. iv. *De Communione Fidelium*, Decr. xiv. n. iv.

[4] Pars ii. tit. x. n. xxix. [5] Merati, l. c. n. lvi.

[6] Cavalieri, l. c.

the purity required for the sacred function he is about to be engaged in.[1] Cavalieri thinks it may be omitted without any fault if the hands be already clean, though he still recommends a compliance with the letter of the rubric.[2]

658. Having washed his hands, he vests in surplice and stole. Nothing short of strict necessity can dispense him from the obligation of wearing these vestments in giving communion;[3] but there can be no difficulty in complying with the rubric in the present case, for it is supposed that communion is administered in the church.

The colour of the stole should be that which is suited to the office of the day, in other words, that of the vestments used in the mass of the day. Baruffaldi,[4] Merati,[5] Baldeschi,[6] and others, are of opinion that white, as the colour appropriated specially to the Blessed Eucharist, may be used on any day. But, the question being referred to the Sacred Congregation, it was decided that the colour should be that of the office of the day, according to the literal meaning of the rubric.[7]

It may be observed, that on the 2nd November, the office of the day is not the office for the dead, but the festive office which is recited with the office of the dead.[8] On Good Friday, communion cannot be administered unless as the viaticum.[9] And when communion is ad-

[1] Cfr. Gavan., pars. ii. tit. i. rub. 1. lit. e.
[2] Cap. iv. Decr. xlii. n. xv.
[3] Vid. infra, chap. xiv. § xii.
[4] Tit. xxiv. 23–27.
[5] Para. ii. tit. x. n. xxxi.
[6] *Esposizione*, etc., par. i. cap. iii. art. ii. n. 10.
[7] 12 Mar. 1836, *in una Trident.*, ad 13, n. 4777.
[8] Vid. De Herdt, pars. v. n. 32.
[9] Infra, § xii.

ministered as the viaticum, the colour of the stole should be white.[1]

659. The clerk, or minister who attends the priest, should be already vested in soutane and surplice,[2] and in readiness to go before him from the sacristy, where we suppose him to vest, to the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is kept.

The clerk should have previously gone to this altar to prepare it by removing the cover, lighting the candles, etc.

He should also place on the altar a small vessel of water, and a purificator, for the ablution of the priest's fingers.[3]

660. It is enough to light two candles, according to Baruffaldi;[4] but Merati would have, besides, a torch, lighted at the epistle side, and, on festival days, one at the gospel side also.[5] Torches, however, are seldom used at communion, unless when it is given "intra mis-"sam solemnem". At solemn mass, acolytes, with lighted candles, are permitted to accompany the priest in giving communion, but the same is not permitted at low mass.[6]

661. The rubric directs him to proceed with his hands joined, from which it would seem that the burse, containing the corporal, should be carried by the clerk, as is expressly directed by the rubric regarding communion of the sick.[7] Baruffaldi[8] and Cavalieri[9] approve of this, if

[1] Chap. xiv. § xii.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 126.
[3] Merati, n. xxxiv. Baruff., l. c. n. 73.
[4] Tit. xxiv. n. 34.
[5] Loc. cit. n. xxxiv.
[6] Sac. Rit. Cong., 12 Aug. 1854, *in Lucion.* ad 72 et 73.
[7] Infra, chap. xiv. § xiii.
[8] Loc. cit. n. 87.
[9] *De Communione Fidelium*, Decr. xiii. n. xx. et n. xlii.

the attendant be really a "clericus"; but, if not, they would have it, carried by the priest himself. Merati[1] and Catalani[2] would have the burse and the key of the tabernacle previously placed on the altar by the sacristan. The Sacred Congregation, however, without precisely condemning what is sanctioned by these high authorities, has declared that it is becoming (decere) that the burse be carried by the priest himself.[3] It has also declared that the burse, containing the corporal, should be used whenever communion is given "extra missam", and that the rubric requiring it is preceptive.[4] From these decisions it is not unreasonable to infer that the priest may be said to proceed "manibus junctis", while carrying the burse: for it is hard to suppose that the Sacred Congregation would recommend what is incompatible with the observance of a clear rubric of the ritual.

662. All things, then, being ready, the priest, vested in surplice and stole, puts on his cap, takes the burse, holding it horizontally with his left hand under, and his right over it, the opening being turned towards him; and having saluted the cross of the sacristy, goes, preceded by the clerk or clerks, to the altar, where, having uncovered and given his cap to the clerk, he genuflects *in plano*, and ascends to the predella

The manner of carrying the burse is not prescribed by any authority we have seen, but the above is suggested by the way in which it is carried over the chalice for

[1] Loc. cit. n. xxxiv.
[2] Cap. ii. § 1. n. xiv.
[3] 24 Sept. 1842, *in Neapol.*, ad 3. n. 4950.
[4] 27 Feb. 1847, *Cong. Cler. Reg. Sanct. Crucis*, n. 5068.

mass.[1] The rest is in exact accordance with the instructions of Merati[2] and of Vavasseur, who gives a number of authorities for them.[3]

According to Merati,[4] Bauldry,[5] and Catalani,[6] he should say a short prayer on his knees before ascending the altar. Other writers are silent on this, as the rubric does not mention it; but it appears to be implicitly recommended in a previous rubric regarding the administration of the sacraments generally.[7]

663. Having ascended the altar, he takes the corporal out of the burse (which he places on the gospel side as at the commencement of mass), unfolds and spreads it out on the middle of the altar, opens the tabernacle, and genuflects; takes out the ciborium and places it on the corporal, shuts the door of the tabernacle, uncovers the ciborium, putting the lid on the corporal, but the veil, if it have one, outside the corporal, and then genuflects a second time.[8]

There is an obvious reason why the veil of the ciborium should not be placed on the corporal, viz., because minute fragments might easily adhere to it. On the other hand, the lid or cover of the ciborium should be placed on the corporal.[9] It would seem, therefore, that the veil should be fastened to the lid in such a way as to be very easily removed. Catalani, however, supposes that it is fastened in such a way as to be inseparable from the cover.[10] When

[1] Baldeschi, *Esposizione*, cap. i. art. i. n. 6.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Part. iv. chap. ii. *Maniere de donner la Sainte Communion*, art. ii.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Pars. iii. cap. 8, n. ii.
[6] Loc. cit. n. xiii.
[7] Supra, chap. ii. § vi.
[8] Vavass., loc. cit. art. i. n. 122.
[9] Vavass., l. c. Baruff., n. 40.
[10] Loc. cit. n. xiii. in fine.

it is so fastened, the cover, we think, should be placed with it outside the corporal.

664. The corporal is so called, because it is the linen on which the body of our Lord is laid. On it the host is consecrated at mass, and on it the pyxis or vessel containing the Blessed Sacrament should always repose, unless when carried by the priest. This is the practice everywhere. It is either expressly prescribed by the rubric as in the present instance, or it is required by the common teaching of rubricists.[1]

The corporal should be of fine linen, and blessed by the bishop, or one having the requisite faculties.[2] The edges may be trimmed with lace, but no ornament of any kind is permitted in the centre.[3] The pall may be used, if necessary, instead of the corporal. In fact it was formerly a part of the corporal, and is still regarded as such, being blessed with the very same benediction.[4]

The burse, containing the corporal, should be of the same colour as the stole, *i.e.*, the colour suited to the office of the day.[5]

§ II.—**Minister genibus flexis, nomine populi ad cornu Epistolæ facit Confessionem generalem, dicens:** *Confiteor Deo, etc.*

665. The minister or clerk having genuflected with the priest, but a little behind,[6] on first coming to the altar,

[1] Cfr. Mel. Theol., IV^me^ Serie, 3^me^ Cahier, pag. 375.
[2] Rub. Miss. *Ritus Servandus*, etc. n. 1.
[3] Romæe, pars. i. cap. i. art. iv. n. viii.
[4] Merati, pars. ii. tit. i. n. xv. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 388.
[5] Catal., loc. cit. n. xiv. [6] Merati, pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxxiv.

remains on his knees at the epistle side (if there be two, one is at the gospel side also), and commences the " *Con-* " *fiteor*", etc. He makes this confession in the name of the communicants, as is prescribed both here and in the rubric of the missal.[1] The ceremony was introduced first in the communion of monks and religious, and then gradually extended to all the faithful.[2] At the words " *et* " *tibi Pater*", the clerk turns his head a little towards the priest. At the words " *mea culpa*", etc., he strikes his breast three times with the right hand, placing the left at the same time under his breast.[3]

Before, or immediately after, the " *Confiteor*", he will present the communion cloth, unless it be already prepared at the rails. And should the priest require the use of a step to reach the tabernacle, he will be careful to place it on the predella, and remove it at the proper time.[4]

§ III.—**Tum Sacerdos iterum genuflectit, et manibus junctis ante pectus vertit se ad populum (advertens ne terga vertat Sacramento), et in cornu Evangelii dicit:** *Misereatur vestri, etc.*

Dicens: *Indulgentiam, etc.*, **manu dextera in formam Crucis signat communicandos.**

666. The priest is supposed to have made two genuflexions already, one before and the other after taking out the pyxis.[5] The rubric here prescribes a third, immediately before the " *Misereatur*", etc. But should it happen, as it generally does, that the " *Confiteor*" is

[1] *Rit. Celeb. Missam.*, tit. x. n. 6. [2] Catal., tit. iv. cap. ii. § ii. n. ii.
[3] Vavass. part. iv. sec. ii. *De Servant de la Messe Basse*, n. 239 et 258.
[4] Vavass., l. c. [5] Supra, n. 663.

finished before the priest has made the second genuflexion on uncovering the ciborium, the second would coincide with the one here prescribed, and a third would, therefore, be unnecessary. This is clearly implied by Merati[1] and De Herdt.[2]

667. Having genuflected in the centre, he joins his hands before his breast, and turns so as to stand a little on the gospel side, facing partly the communicants, and partly the epistle corner.[3] In this position he says "*Misereatur* "*vestri*", etc., then "*Indulgentiam, absolutionem*", etc., making the sign of the cross with his right hand, the left being placed under his breast. He makes the first line of the cross by raising his hand as high as his forehead and then lowering it to his breast, saying at the same time, "*Indulgentiam, absolutionem*", and the second line by moving it from his left shoulder to his right, pronouncing the words "*et remissionem peccatorum vestrorum*", then joining his hands, he continues "*tribuat vobis*", etc.[4] He keeps the fingers joined and extended, for the thumb and index are not required to be joined as in giving communion "intra missam".

The hand, while forming the cross, should be always in a vertical plane at right angles to his breast, and before drawing the second or tranverse line, it should be raised as high as the shoulder in the same plane in which it was lowered.[5]

668. The words "*vestri*", "*vos*", "*vestrorum*", "*vobis*",

[1] Loc. cit. n. xxxiv. [2] Pars. ii. n. 28. v.
[3] Merati, pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxiv. [4] De Herdt, l. c. i.
[5] Cfr. Caron, *Les Cérémonies de la Messe Basse*, art. i. n. 11, et art. xiii. n. 114.

are used even when there is but one communicant, as they are addressed to all, even to those who communicate only spiritually.[1] The words should be pronounced in a clear distinct voice, and the clerk should answer "*Amen*" at the end of each, as he does at the beginning of mass.[2]

§ IV.—**Deinde ad Altare se convertit, genuflectit, manu sinistra pyxidem prehendit; et duobus digitis, pollice et indice, Sacramentum accipit, et elevat; conversusque ad populum in medio Altaris dicit clara voce:** *Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi.* **Mox subdit:** *Domine, non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, sed tantum dic verbo, et sanabitur anima mea;* **quod iterum ac tertio repetit: qua formula etiam utendum est, cum fœminæ Communio administratur.**

669. Having pronounced the "*Indulgentiam*", etc., he turns to the centre of the altar, and genuflects, separating his hands and resting them on the altar outside the corporal.[3] At communion "intra missam", he places his hands on the corporal, having the thumb and index of each joined, as they have touched the Blessed Sacrament. Then he takes the ciborium in his left hand by the knob or centre of the stem, and with the thumb and index of the right hand (the other three fingers being joined and extended), he takes one of the consecrated particles, and holds it elevated a little over the centre of the ciborium, so that it may be seen above it, keeping the hand at the same time resting on the edge of the ciborium; then turning by his right, he faces the people, having his back to the centre of the altar.[4]

[1] Baruff. n. 47. Gavant., pars. ii. tit. x. Rub. 6. lit. (f).
[2] De Herdt. l. c.
[3] De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28. v.
[4] De Herdt, l. c. i.

670. He takes this position though all the communicants be at the epistle or gospel side, and even though there be another pyxis containing the Blessed Sacrament on the altar.[1] De Herdt[2] would except the case in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, and would have him then stand a little to the gospel side; but Merati says expressly, that he stands with his back to the centre of the altar, "etiamsi esset Sacramentum expositum".[3] So does Cavalieri.[4] It appears, however, from a recent decision of the Sacred Congregation, that it is not allowed to give communion at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.[5] At least it is not allowed unless in case of necessity, as *e.g.*, when there is no other altar in the church, etc.[6]

671. In this position he says in a clear distinct voice, his eyes fixed on the Blessed Sacrament, "*Ecce Agnus* "*Dei*", etc., and in the same voice, still holding the Sacred Host in the same way, he says three times, "*Domine non* "*sum dignus*", etc. He pronounces these words exactly as they are in the ritual, without any change of number or gender, no matter how many communicate, or even though all should be females.

Gavantus observes[7] that the use of the words "*Ecce* "*Agnus*", etc., taken from the gospel,[8] is not very ancient though extremely appropriate. The words "*Domine non* "*sum dignus*", etc., are said in the name of the communi-

[1] Baruff., n. 52. Merati, pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxv.
[2] Loc. cit. [3] Loc. cit.
[4] Cap. iv. *De Commun. Fidelium*, Decr. xi. n. xiii.
[5] 12 Nov. 1831. *in Tarent*, n. 4677.
[6] Cfr. *Annotat. in Decr. cit.* in Collect. Gardell.
[7] Loc. cit. litera (g). [8] John, i. 29.

cants, and were formerly said, not by the priest, but by themselves.[1] St. Charles prescribed that they be said in their name by the deacon or a clerk, in a clear voice.[2] Both the missal and the ritual, however, clearly prescribe that they be said by the priest. But the communicants may say them at the same time, "submissa voce". The rubric[3] even prescribes this in communion of the sick.[4] They may also strike their breasts in the usual way according to Falise,[5] although Merati says this should be done only by the clerk on behalf of all.[6]

672. In some places it was usual for the priest to repeat in the vernacular, the "*Ecce Agnus*", etc., and "*Domine non sum*", etc. Cavalieri[7] cites a ritual in which the priest is even directed to invite the communicants to join with him in saying the "*Domine non sum dignus*", etc., which he is to say the second and third time, not in Latin, but in the vernacular. The Sacred Congregation, however, having been consulted on the subject, decided that the practice should be discontinued.[8] But he is permitted to give an instruction immediately before administering the sacrament, in accordance with what is prescribed in a preceding rubric;[9] and it was decided that, at mass, he may give this instruction after his own communion.[10]

[1] Catal., § iv. n. ii.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. iv. *Instruct. Euch.*, p. 427.

[3] Infra, chap. xiv. § xix. [4] Vid. Caval. cap. iv. Decr. ix. n. vi.

[5] Part. III^mo^ chap. iii. § ii. n. 4.

[6] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxvi. [7] Loc. cit.

[8] 23 Mai, 1835, *in und Capucinorum*, ad 5, n. 4748. [9] Chap. ii. § x.

[10] Sac. Rit. Cong. 16 April, 1853, *in Una Ord. Min.*, ad 24, n. 5183. 12 Sept. 1857, *in Molinen*, ad 10.

§ V.—**Postea ad communicandum accedit, incipiens ab iis qui sunt ad partem Epistolæ.**

673. Having said "*Domine non sum*", etc., the third time, he descends by the middle of the front steps, even though the communicants be entirely at the gospel, or entirely at the epistle side—as is often the case in convent chapels. This was decided by the Sacred Congregation.[1] Having reached the floor, he may then go straight to the place where he commences the distribution. This should be at the epistle side, as is here directed by the rubric, or at least at what corresponds with the epistle side, so that he always commences with the communicant on his extreme left, moving from left to right; and, when he has finished one row, returning and commencing the next in the same place, and so on.[2]

§ VI.—**Sed primo, si Sacerdotibus, vel aliis ex Clero danda sit Communio, iis ad gradus Altaris genuflexis præbeatur, vel si commode fieri potest, intra sepimentum Altaris sint a laicis distincti. Sacerdotes vero cum stola communicent.**

674. Members of the clergy are admitted to holy communion at the altar steps, or at least within the sanctuary, and hence, when any of them are for communion, the priest administers it to them before he leaves the predella, or at least between the altar and the rails.

675. A priest cannot receive communion from his own hand "extra missam", if there be another to administer it: "Si tamen desit alterius sacerdotis copia", says Cavalieri,

[1] 15 Sept. 1736, *in Tolet*, ad 8, n. 4055.
[2] Baruff., n. 56. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28. i.

"haud dubito posse licite seipsum communicare, nedum "in casu necessitatis, puta in articulo mortis, sed etiam "causa solius devotionis".[1]

676. Priests, in receiving communion, should always wear a stole. Its colour should be suited to the office of the day,[2] and it should be worn hanging from the neck, as is expressly prescribed by the "Cæremoniale Episco- "porum".[3] But religious are permitted to wear it crossed on the breast, and fastened with the cincture of the habit.[4]

The rubric here says nothing of the surplice, which, however, the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum"[5] supposes to be worn. In private communions it probably may be dispensed with, according to Cavalieri;[6] but on public solemn occasions there is no doubt it should be worn. Catalani[7] mentions, seemingly with approval, the practice of some churches, according to which deacons, in communicating, wear the stole on the left shoulder. But both the ritual and the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" are silent about deacons, and hence it is justly concluded by Cavalieri[8] that priests alone should wear the stole, the rest of the clergy, deacons included, communicating simply in surplice.

§ VII.—**Sacerdos unicuique porrigens Sacramentum, et faciens cum eo signum Crucis super pyxidem, simul dicit:** *Corpus Domini, etc.*

677. In the early ages of the Church the Blessed

[1] Tom. iv. cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. viii. Cfr. St. Lig., n. 238 *in parenth.*
[2] Caval., tom. iv. cap. i. Decr. v. n. vii. [3] Lib. ii. cap. xxiii. n. 6.
[4] Sac. Cong. Rit. 30 Sept. 1679, *in una Capucin.*, ad 9, n. 2903. Cfr. Caval. l. c., n. iv. [5] Loc. cit. [6] Loc. cit. n. v.
[7] Tit. iv. cap. ii. § v. n. vi. [8] Loc. cit. n. vi.

Eucharist was put into the hand of the communicant, t right hand being presented resting on the left in form a cross.[1] The men received it in the naked hand, t women in a linen cloth, which was called "Dominicale This usage was general throughout the Church until t seventh century. Afterwards the present mode of a ministering the sacrament, which had been in use Rome as early as the middle of the sixth century, w gradually introduced and adopted everywhere througho the western Church.[3]

678. Although the sacrament was, from the ve beginning, often administered under the species of bre alone, and its administration under the species of wine the communion of the laity gradually fell into disu and was for good reasons abolished in the weste Church,[4] there is no doubt that it was for many centuri usually administered under both species, as it still is the Greek and other eastern churches.

679. In giving communion under both species it w at first the universal practice, after the administration the host, to present the chalice to the communicant, wl drank out of it in the ordinary way, but very soon r course was had to various expedients, in order to less the danger of effusion. In some churches the commur cants sucked a portion of the contents through a re or pipe. In others, the consecrated bread was dipp into the chalice, and was put thus moistened with t

[1] Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Ritib.*, lib. i cap. iv. art. x. n. viii.
[3] Martene, ibid.
[3] Martene, ibid.
[4] Vid. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, lib. iv. cap. xxviii.

precious blood, into the mouth of the communicant. This practice was very commonly adopted.[1]

680. In some of the eastern churches, according to Renaudot, a little was taken out of the chalice and given to the communicant with a spoon, the use of the reed being unknown amongst them. But the "Communio "intincta", just described, was everywhere adopted by them in the communion of the laity, and even of the inferior clergy, when not actually serving at the altar. "Quod igitur Ecclesiis omnibus commune est, Sacerdos "primus accipit Corpus Christi, tum ex calice bibit san- "guinem Christi. Deinde sacerdotibus qui sacrificio "interfuerunt sacram particulam ipse porrigit: calicem "quoque dat ipse, vel diaconus, ut ex eo bibant. Ita "etiam alicubi observatum fuit ad communionem diaconi "ministrantis; vulgo tamen, tam ipsi quam diaconis et "reliquis ex clero, particula intincta cochleari distribuitur, "postea tandem laicis. Communis est Græcis, ut omnibus "Ecclesiis orientalibus, hæc disciplina".[2]

681. The details are not given in the Euchologium, but there is no doubt that the two consecrated species are usually mixed in the chalice, and with a spoon are put both together, in a very small quantity, into the mouth of the communicant. Goar, describing the ceremony in the Greek Church, says,[3] "Particulam quam- "libet sanguine perfusam (junctas enim panis et vini "species ille ritus ostendit, ubi supra diaconus sacrum

[1] Martene, loc. cit. n. xiii.

[2] Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, vol. ii. pag. 118. Vid. seq. ibid. et vol. i. pag. 261 et seq.

[3] ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ, etc., *in S. Chrysost. Missam Notæ*, n. 179, pag. 151.

"discum spongia tersit et cuncta fragmenta panis in "calicem mersit) *μαργαρίτην* quasi *unionem pretiosissi-* "*mam* vocant, eumque cochleari parvulo (cujus manu- "brium tenue et oblongum crucicula in extremitate orna- "tum est) pro communione e calice educit".

682. The same author tells us that what is reserved by the Greeks for the communion of the sick is consecrated only on Holy Thursday. The consecrated bread, having been dipped in the precious blood, is carefully and reverently dried over a fire. It is afterwards moistened with ordinary wine before it is administered. This, of course, cannot be looked on as communion under both species, for, as Goar observes, the species of wine is no longer there; yet the Greeks seem to regard it as such, for their object in dipping the consecrated bread, prepared as described, into ordinary wine, before administering it, is "ut sopitæ et exsiccatæ sanguinis species "quasi de novo exsuscitari et emergere videantur".[1]

The practice thus described by Renaudot and Goar still continues throughout the east, as we have been assured by a priest formerly a member of the Russo-Greek Church, and as we have learned also from a Syrian priest intimately acquainted with the existing discipline in the churches of the Levant.

683. The manner of giving communion throughout the western Church is that which is directed by the present rubric. The priest, holding the sacred host over the ciborium, makes the sign of the cross by raising it about three or four inches in a vertical line, and then

[1] Ibid., not. 180, pag. 153. Vid. not. 32, *In Præsanctif. Notæ*, pag. 208.

lowering it as far in the same line, raising it again about half the height, and then drawing the transverse line (thus signing the communicant according to Baldeschi),[1] taking care not to pass the limits of the ciborium. He says, at the same time, "*Corpus Domini*", *etc.*, concluding the words as he places the sacred host on the tongue of the communicant.[2]

In taking each particle out of the ciborium he would do well to cause the minute fragments that may adhere to it to fall back, as he may do by gently striking his finger and thumb on the edge of the ciborium before making the sign of the cross.[3]

684. According to the usage of the early Church, the form in administering the sacrament was simply, "*Corpus* "*Christi, Sanguis Christi*", to which the communicant answered "*Amen*", as appears from St. Augustine, *Serm.* 272, and St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Pammachium*, cited by Martene.[4] In conformity with this ancient usage, St. Charles directs the priest to pronounce the words only as far as "*vitam æternam*", and give time to the communicant to answer "*Amen*", before receiving the host.[5] But the rubric here, as well as that of the missal,[6] plainly requires that the word "*Amen*" be said by the priest, and not by the communicant.

At a mass of ordination, however, the bishop in giving communion to the newly ordained uses the form: "*Corpus*

[1] *Esposizione*, etc., tom. i. par. i. cap. iii. art. i. n. 8.
[2] Baruff., tit. xxiv. n. 66. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28. i.
[3] De Herdt, loc. cit. [4] Lib. i. cap. iv. art. x. n. ix.
[5] Pars. iv. *Instruc. Euch.* § *Ordo ministrandi Sacram Communionem*, pag. 427. [6] *Rit. Celeb. Missam.*, tit. x. rub. 6.

"*Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam æter-*
"*nam*", and the rubric of the Pontifical directs each to answer "*Amen*". But he is not permitted to use this form in giving communion at any other time.[1]

685. In the rubric of the missal[2] it is prescribed that, when the sacred name occurs in the prayers, the head be inclined towards the cross. It was decided also by the Sacred Congregation[3] that the priest, at his own communion, when signing himself with the host and chalice, should incline his head at the sacred name, "juxta "rubricas". Hence it might be concluded, by analogy, that he should do so also, every time he pronounces it, when giving communion to others, and in fact Vavasseur states it as the common teaching of authors that he should.[4] But we have not seen it prescribed by any author except himself, and we are, therefore, disposed to adopt the opinion of Romsée, who is in favour of omitting it, at least when there is a considerable number of communicants. . . . . "Quia in diuturnâ Eucharistiæ dis-
"tributione frequens et, ut ita dicam, continua inclina-
"tionis renovatio aliquid indecori habet. Ideoque circa
"debitum hujus inclinationis silent auctores ususque
"generalis eam negligit".[5]

It is hardly necessary to say, however, that he should show all possible attention and devotion in this holy function, keeping his eyes during the entire time fixed on the Blessed Sacrament.

[1] Sac. Rit. Cong., 7 Maii. 1853, *in Grossetan*, ad 3 n. 5186.
[2] *Rit. Cel. Miss.*, tit. v. n. 2.
[3] 24 Sept. 1842, *in Neapol.*, ad 1. n. 4950.
[4] Pars. iv. chap. ii. *Manière de donner*, etc., n. 121.
[5] Pars. i. cap. ii. art. xiv. *De Communione Fidelium*, n. vii.

686. A bishop, in giving communion, presents his hand to be kissed, according to what is prescribed in the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum",[1] and Bauldry observes that the communicant should kiss the hand, and *not* the ring.[2] A priest, however, is not allowed to present his hand to be kissed by the communicant, as was decided by the Sacred Congregation.[3]

687. In placing the host on the tongue of the communicant he must be careful to avoid touching the face, and hence it is recommended that the three fingers, which are extended while he takes each particle out of the ciborium and makes the sign of the cross, be closed under the index and thumb, in the act of putting it on the tongue.[4] He must also endeavour, as far as possible, not to allow his fingers to be moistened by contact with the tongue. He should, therefore, take each particle, not by the middle, but by the edge, and present it so that the opposite edge may first come in contact with the tongue, then by withdrawing a little the index finger, which is under the host, he is likely to avoid all contact, especially if the communicants are instructed as to the manner of presenting themselves.[5]

688. It is very often, however, impossible to prevent the fingers from being moistened. Writers on the rubrics are not agreed as to what should be done in this case. When the fingers are moist, the particles adhere to them, and it is difficult to continue the distribution. Besides,

[1] Lib. ii. cap. xxix. n. 5.
[2] *Manuale Sac. Cær.*, pars. v. ex 2^do^ Lib. Cær. Epis. cap. 29, n. iv.
[3] 22 Nov. 1659, in *Matherana*, n. 2008. [4] De Herdt, l. c. ii. 3°.
[5] De Herdt, l. c. 4°. Baldeschi, pars. I^a^ cap. iii. art. i. n. 8 in nota.

many have, very naturally, an objection to receive from the priest while his fingers are in this state.

For these reasons several authors, Merati,[1] Lacroix,[2] De Herdt,[3] with Vinitor, Pavone, Lohner, cited by the "Melanges Theologiques",[4] recommend him to have in his left hand, under the ciborium or patena, a purificator, in which he may dry his fingers.

They say, however, that he should first carefully rub them against each other over the ciborium, so that any fragment adhering to them may fall into it, and then, joining them as before, press them on the purificator.

In giving communion at mass, this purificator should be different from that which is used with the chalice.[5] It is most conveniently held by passing it over the middle finger, and allowing it to hang loosely.[6]

689. Baldeschi,[7] and Vavasseur, who cites him,[8] are altogether opposed to the use of the purificator in this way, but they manifestly go too far, when they assert that it is not approved of by any author of note. Cavalieri,[9] no doubt, is opposed to it, but he recommends what St. Charles prescribes,[10] viz.: that the priest return to the altar, and there wash his fingers in a vessel prepared for the purpose, and dry them with a purificator, or without returning to the altar, have the vessel and purificator brought by a clerk. This, of course, would be a most effectual way of obviating all irreverence; but there are few, if any, places in which it is adopted, probably on

[1] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxvi. [2] Lib. vi. pars. i. n. 481.
[3] Loc. cit. i. et ii. 4°. [4] VI^me^ Serie, 4^me^ Cahier, p. 539.
[5] A. A. cit. [6] De Herdt, l. c. [7] Loc. cit.
[8] Loc. cit. note (1). [9] Cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. xxxiv.
[10] *Instructiones Eucharistiæ*, loc. cit.

account of the great interruption it would cause, and the inconvenience of going to the altar as often as would be required. On the other hand, the use of the purificator, in the manner already explained, is common enough, and with the precautions recommended, appears to be free from any danger of irreverence.

On the whole, therefore, in the case of a priest who finds from experience that in administering communion he cannot keep his fingers free from saliva, we would subscribe to the opinion of Merati, who, after citing the recommendation of Quarti and Diana, to keep the fingers free, adds: "Verum quia difficile est hoc inconveniens "evitare: ideo absque ullo scrupulo introducendi novam "rubricam, in sententia sum illorum qui tale purificato- "rium adhibendum esse approbant".[1]

690. Should it happen that the host he has in his fingers when saying "*Ecce Agnus Dei*", etc., adheres to them on account of pespiration in very warm weather or the like, he may put it back into the ciborium and take another to give to the first communicant.[2]

691. The rubric directs that care be taken to have as many particles as will suffice for the number of communicants;[3] but should it be observed near the close that there are not enough, the priest may divide them, so as to be able to give communion to all.[4] He should return to the altar to make this division,[5] and it is recommended that,

[1] Loc. cit. Vid. Mel. Theol. l. c.

[2] Baruff., tit. xxiv. n. 55. De Herdt, n. 28. ii. 6.

[3] Vid. supra, chap, xi. § v.

[4] Sac. Rit. Cong. 16 Maii., 1863, *in Veronen.*, ad. i. n. 4707.

[5] Caron, *Les Cérémonies de La Messe Basse*, art. xiv. n. 125. Rit. Toul cit. apud Mel. Theol. l. c. p. 589.

if possible, the parts thus broken be given to the bet instructed, for some ignorant persons might suppose tl there is an important difference between one of th and a whole particle.[1]

691. It is a question whether, in the same circu stances, the host that has been used for Benediction of t Blessed Sacrament, may be broken and distribute There is no doubt that, as a general rule, the pri should consume this host, as is directed in the "Instru tions for the Forty Hours".[2] Besides, it is expres prohibited by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of t Council, to give two or more particles together, or o larger than usual, or indeed any but a single particle of t ordinary size.[3] Hence Cavalieri, commenting on tl decree, infers that it is not permitted to break and d tribute a large host, and he would not allow it, except give communion to one in danger of death, when the is no other host consecrated.[4] In this case he wou even permit the priest to give a portion of the large ho which he has consecrated at mass, if he got notice befo communion, and had no other, but he would not perm it when there is question merely of not disappointi persons who present themselves for communion.

St. Liguori, however,[5] clearly implies that it may l done if the parties presenting themselves cannot wa without inconvenience. Collet[6] teaches the same.[7] W

[1] De Herdt, l. c. 7°.
[2] *Instr. Clement.* § xxi.
[3] 12 Febr. 1679, apud Caval. cap. iv. *De Communione Fidelium* Decr. ii.
[4] Loc. cit. n. viii. et ix.
[5] Lib. vi. n. 245, *Sufficit autem* in parenth.
[6] *Traité des Saints Mystères*, chap. xiv. n. 17.
[7] Cfr. De Lugo, Disp. xx. n. 69.

think the decision may apply in the same circumstances to the distribution of the host used at Benediction.

693. If another priest be celebrating mass at the altar where he is giving communion, or at an altar beside it, he does not genuflect at the elevation, but merely turns to the altar, holding the ciborium in his hands, and waits in that position till the elevation is over.[1]

§ VIII.—**Ubi vero omnes communicaverint, Sacerdos reversus ad Altare dicere poterit:** *O Sacrum, etc.*

Tempore Paschali additur, *Alleluia.* **Mox Sacerdos dicit:** ℣. *Domine exaudi, etc.*

Tempore Paschali dicitur Oratio: *Spiritum nobis, etc.*

694. When all have communicated, the priest returns to the altar, but always by the middle of the front step.[2] He keeps the thumb and index united over the ciborium, the other fingers being extended.[3] Having reached the altar, he rubs the thumb and index against each other so as to make any minute fragment adhering to them fall into the ciborium, and genuflects.[4] He then washes his fingers in the vessel prepared, and dries them with the purificator, and with the hand thus perfectly free he covers the ciborium.[5] Then, and not sooner, according to Cavalieri,[6] he says the antiphon, "*O Sacrum*", etc., with the versicles and prayer, which he should say, "alta voce et manibus

[1] De Herdt, l. c. 5.

[2] Caval. vol. iv. cap. iv. Decr. xi. n. xvii. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28, i.

[3] De Herdt, l. c. [4] Vid. infra, § x.

[5] Cav. cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. xl. De Herdt, l. c. v. Falise, par. iii. chap. iii. § ii. n. 6.

[6] Loc. cit. n. xxviii.

"junctis", according to De Herdt.[1] It is plain from the word "**reversus**", that he should not say them until he he has returned to the altar; but Baldeschi[2] would permit him to say them while washing the fingers, etc. There is nothing in the rubric to prevent this, and we believe it is generally done.

695. "*Alleluia*" is to be added to the antiphon, as well as to the ℣. *Panem*, etc., according to Cavalieri[3] and Merati,[4] in Paschal time, and during the octave of "Corpus "Christi". The prayer "*Deus qui nobis*", etc., should have the long conclusion, while the prayer substituted for it in Paschal time, "*Spiritum nobis*", etc., should have the short conclusion, as appears by the "Propaganda" edition of the Ritual. Baruffaldi[5] and Merati[6] teach that "*Dominus vobiscum*" should here be omitted; but they were deceived by the terms of a decree which they refer to, but which regarded the prayers before Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, at the close of the solemn procession on Corpus Christi, or at the close of the "Quarant' Ore".[7] The Sacred Congregation having been consulted as to whether it should be said, replied: "Affir-"mative ut præscribitur in Rituali Romano".[8]

He is to say all aloud, according to De Herdt,[9] and as may be inferred from the rubric, which requires the minister to respond.

[1] Loc. cit.
[2] Par. i. cap. iii. art. ii. n. 11.
[3] Loc. cit. n. xxx.
[4] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxxiii.
[5] Tit. xxiv. n. 70.
[6] Loc. cit.
[7] 3 Martii, 1761, *in Aquen.*, ad 7, n. 4299. Vid. infra, chap. xiv. § xxiv.
[8] 24 Sept. 1842, *in una* 3ii *Ord. Sti. Franc.* ad 3, n. 4947.
[9] Loc. cit.

696. The words "**dicere poterit**", imply that there is no obligation, but that it is merely of counsel to say the antiphon, "*O Sacrum*", etc.[1] De Herdt[2] seems to extend this to the versicles and prayer also. But Cavalieri thinks that it cannot be so extended, and that the versicles and prayer are obligatory, for the rubric regarding communion of the sick, saying nothing of the antiphon, prescribes the versicles and prayer, when the priest has returned to the church, and has placed the Blessed Sacrament on the altar, "**deinde dicit**", ℣.; "*Panem de cœlo*", etc.,[3] and here also the rubric has "**mox dicit**", not "**dicere poterit**", ℣. "*Domine exaudi*", etc.[4] And this view of Cavalieri is sustained by the word, "præscribitur" in the above answer of the Sacred Congregation.

§ IX.—**Antequam reponat Sacramentum, diligenter advertat ut, si fragmentum aliquod digitis adhæserit, illud in pyxidem deponat; et eosdem digitos, quibus tetigit Sacramentum, abluat, et abstergat purificatorio: ablutionem vero sumat, si celebraverit, aut iis qui tunc communicarunt sumendam tradat, aut saltem in sacrarium injiciat.**

697. The ablution of the fingers takes place before he covers the ciborium, according to the authorities above cited.[5] But according to others it takes place after.[6] The priest may follow either order, but we should prefer that which enables him to have the fingers free in covering

[1] Baruff., n. 68. [2] Pars. ii. n. 28, v.
[3] Infra, chap. xiv. § xxvi.
[4] Caval., cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. xxix.
[5] Supra, n. 694.
[6] Merati, l. c. xxxiv. in fine. Baldeschi, l. c.

the ciborium, when it is possible for him to follow it. He cannot follow it when he gives communion at mass, for then he does not purify the fingers until the second ablution, as is plain from the order prescribed by the rubric of the missal.[1]

The wording of the rubrics does not define minutely the order that is to be followed in the several acts, and hence it is differently laid down in different authors. We may observe, however, that the "**Antequam reponat**", in the present rubric may be fairly understood to imply, "before he even covers the ciborium"; since he evidently should examine the fingers before covering it; and it is not improbable that the words may be understood in the same sense as qualifying the second clause also, regarding the ablution of the fingers. But we would not extend it to the third clause, since no one would require him to leave the ciborium uncovered until he has first disposed of the ablution.

698. The priest himself may take this ablution if he has already said mass (for if he have yet to say mass, he cannot take it, as it would break his fast), or he may give it to one of the communicants. But as he might have a repugnance to take it on account of the probable contact of his fingers with the saliva of the communicants, and as any of the communicants might have a similar repugnance, he is permitted to throw it into the sacrarium.[2] And this is what is usually done, according to Baruffaldi[3] and Merati,[4] who further observes that it need not be

[1] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 6. Vid. Merati, in loc. n. xxvii.
[2] Caval., cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. xxxvii.
[3] Tit. xxiv. n. 74.
[4] Loc. cit. n. xxxiii.

done every time, but only when the water in the vessel placed on the altar for the purpose, requires to be renewed.

§ X.—**Postea genuflectens reponit Sacramentum in tabernaculo, et clave obserat.**

699. Having done all that is required by the preceding rubrics, he opens the tabernacle, places the ciborium in it with his right hand, his left being supported on the altar,[1] makes a genuflection, and then shuts and locks the door of the tabernacle. The genuflection here marked is the only one that the ritual expressly prescribes after the priest returns to the altar, and Falise,[2] with the "Melanges Theologiques",[3] contends that it is the only one required. The rubric, they say, is so precise regarding the genuflections to be made before distributing the communion,[4] that it would be equally so here if more than one were required. But all the other commentators we have seen prescribe at least two. Cavalieri,[5] Merati,[6] Romsée,[7] Baldeschi,[8] De Herdt,[9] prescribe one immediately on returning to the altar after he has placed the ciborium on the corporal. Merati[10] and De Herdt[11] prescribe another on opening the tabernacle, immediately before putting in the ciborium. Cavalieri would require

[1] Merati, l. c. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28, v.
[2] *Cours Abrégé*, etc., III^me^ Part. chap. iii. § ii. n. 6 in nota.
[3] VI^me^ Serie 4^me^ Cahier, pag. 543.
[4] Supra, § i. et § iii.
[5] Loc. cit. n. xxviii.
[6] Loc. cit. n. xxxiii.
[7] Par. i. cap. ii. art. xiv. n. v.
[8] Par. i. cap. iii. art. ii. n. 11.
[9] Loc. cit.
[10] Loc. cit.
[11] Loc. cit.

this only when there is another ciborium containing the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle.[1] The others make no mention of this genuflection. But all without exception are agreed that one is to be made after placing the ciborium in the tabernacle.

It is the usual practice, beyond doubt, to make a genuflection immediately on returning to the altar, and placing the ciborium on the corporal; and seeing the great weight of authority in favour of it, we think it should be made; but the same cannot be said of the second above mentioned, on opening the tabernacle, and we think, therefore, it may be omitted. The argument from the silence of the rubric cannot be regarded as conclusive; otherwise it would follow that no genuflection should be made in placing the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle when it is brought back to the church, after administering the "Viaticum".[2]

§ XI.—**Deinde extenta manu dextera, benedicit iis qui communicarunt, dicens:** *Benedictio Dei, etc.*

700. Having locked the tabernacle, standing in the centre with his face to the altar, he raises his eyes to the crucifix, extends his hands, and elevates them to the height of his shoulders, then lowers the eyes, joins the hands, and inclines the head while saying "*Benedictio Dei Omnipo-*"*tentis*", after which, turning to the communicants, he continues, "*Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*", making over them the sign of the cross with the right hand, the left being placed on his breast: then joining his hands, he con-

[1] Loc. cit. n. xl. [2] Vid. infra, chap. xiv. § xxviii.

tinues, "*descendat super vos et maneat semper*". To which the clerk answers "*Amen*". This is the manner of giving the benediction, according to Merati,[1] Cavalieri,[2] Baldeschi,[3] De Herdt,[4] Vavasseur.[5] The Sacred Congregation decided that the hands are to be elevated, etc., as in the benediction at mass;[6] but that the altar is not to be kissed.[7]

701. He then turns again to the altar by the same way, not completing the circle as he does at mass,[8] folds the corporal, and puts it into the burse, which he carries himself or leaves to be carried by the clerk,[9] inclines to the cross, and descends to the floor, where having received his cap, he genuflects, puts on his cap, and returns to the sacristy, preceded by the clerk.[10]

According to Cavalieri,[11] the clerk extinguishes the lights while the priest folds the corporal, etc.; but as the priest would be too long delayed by this, the clerk generally returns to extinguish the lights, and put the usual covering on the altar.

§ XII.—**Communio autem populi intra Missam statim post communionem Sacerdotis celebrantis fieri debet (nisi quandoque ex rationabili causa post Missam sit facienda), cum Orationes, quæ in Missa post Communionem dicuntur, non solum ad Sacerdotem, sed etiam ad alios communicantes spectent.**

702. According to the ancient usage, Holy Commu-

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Loc. cit. n. xli. [3] Loc. cit. n. 12. [4] Loc. cit.
[5] Part iv. n. 126. [6] 12 Aug. 1854, *in Lucionen.*, ad 76.
[7] 16 March, 1833, *in Veronen.*, ad 6, 4707.
[8] Caval., n. xlii. Vavass., loc. cit. Baldeschi, loc. cit.
[9] Vid. supra, n. 661.
[10] Caval., l. c. Baldeschi, l. c. Vavasseur, l. c. [11] Loc. cit.

nion was given during mass to all the faithful who assisted at it.[1] The Council of Trent also expresses a wish that at every mass the faithful who are present should communicate, that they may thus receive more abundant fruit from the holy sacrifice.[2] The proper time, then, for distributing holy communion is at mass and immediately after the communion of the celebrant. This is the time marked for it in the ancient liturgies, one of which is cited in the extract already given from the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[3] and it is plain from the present rubric, that this is the time at which the Church still wishes it to be distributed, in order that those who receive it may have all the advantage of the prayers which follow, and which refer to the communion of the faithful, as well as to that of the priest.

703. It is admitted, however, that there may be a sufficient reason for giving communion "extra missam". It is the common teaching of theologians, according to St. Liguori,[4] that it may be administered at any hour except late in the evening or at night. But an answer of the Sacred Congregation restricts it to the same hours of the day as the celebration of mass, that is, from the aurora till mid-day, unless where there is an indult extending the time.[5] The rubric here supposes that there may be a reasonable cause for deferring communion till after mass. One reason commonly assigned as sufficient, is that the

[1] Bened. XIV., *De Sac. Missæ*, lib. ii. cap. xxii. n. 10.

[2] Sess. xxii. cap. vi.

[3] Supra, n. 577. Cfr. Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. art. x. n. vi.

[4] Lib. vi. n. 252.

[5] 7 Sept. 1816, *in Tuden*, ad 37, n. 4526. Cfr. Gury, *De Eucharistia*, n. 297.

congregation may not be kept too long waiting for the conclusion of mass.[1] When there is a great number for communion, the distribution occupies a considerable time, and there may be, amongst the rest of the congregation, many unwilling, many perhaps unable without great inconvenience, to wait so long.

704. There are other reasons also on account of which it may be deferred in the same way. The state of the celebrant's health might require him to leave the altar as soon as possible, or might render him unable to get through the work of distributing communion to great numbers.[2] All the preparations for its distribution may not be completed.[3] Some who wish to go to communion may not have had an opportunity of confessing till after mass.[4] In short, it may be said that whatever would make the distribution of communion after, instead of during mass, notably more convenient to the celebrant, to the communicants, or to the others who are present, may be regarded as a sufficient reason for deferring it.

705. The rubric does not contemplate the giving communion before mass, and Merati cites a decree of the Congregation of the Apostolic Visitation under Urban VIII., which expressly forbids it unless when there is great necessity.[5] It would seem, therefore, that a stronger reason is required for it than for deferring communion till after mass. But there may be sufficient reason to justify it, as is plain from Merati himself, who prescribes what is to be done in

[1] Gavant., pars. ii. tit. x. n. 6. lit. (d). Baruff., tit. xxiv. n. 80. Benedict XIV., *De Sac. Miss.*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. n. 9.

[2] Catal., tit. iv. cap. ii. § x. n. vi. [3] Baruff., l. c.

[4] Supra, n. 581. [5] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxix. in fine.

the case.[1] According to Cavalieri in his commentary this decree of the Apostolic Visitation, there would sufficient reason, if the communicant could not wait the communion of the priest, on account of some pres business, or could not fast so long.[2] Baldeschi,[3] Herdt,[4] and Vavasseur,[5] do not require a more urg reason in one case than in the other; and we believe in practice what has just been said about communion a mass, may be applied also to communion before mass.

706. It was the opinion of Gavantus,[6] that commun could not be given at a requiem mass. It is certain, h ever, by the recent decrees of the Sacred Congregation it may be given, at least if the particles distributed h been consecrated at that mass. But it is a much disp question whether it may be given at a requiem mass w pre-consecrated particles. There have been several deci of the Sacred Congregation on this subject.[7] That January 22, 1701,[8] was in accordance with the opin of Gavantus. It declared simply and without excepti that it is not permitted to administer the Eucharist a requiem mass. This was confirmed by one on the 2 July, 1710. But on the 21st of March, 1711, the previ decree was withdrawn.[9] On the 2d September, 1741, was declared that the Eucharist could not be administe at a requiem mass "per modum Sacramenti, extrahe "pyxidem a custodia", but that it could be administe with particles consecrated at that same mass.

[1] Loc. cit. n. xxxiii.
[2] Cap. iv. Decr. x. n. i
[3] Par. i. cap. iii. n. 13.
[4] Pars. ii. n. 28. v.
[5] *Manière de donner*, etc., n. 127.
[6] Par. ii. tit. x. n. 6 lit
[7] Vid. Append.
[8] *In una Congreg. Montis Coronæ*, ad 11, n. 3
[9] *Ord. Cupuc. Prov. Lugd.*, n. 3833.
[10] *In una Aquen.*, ad 4, n.

707. Merati, who discusses this question at great length, maintains that there is no ground for any distinction between particles consecrated at the mass and pre-consecrated particles, and that communion may be given at a requiem mass with the latter as well as with the former.[1] The view of Merati is adopted and maintained also by Benedict XIV.[2]

These great authorities being so clearly opposed to the decree, the Sacred Congregation was again consulted, and having been asked which should be followed, answered on the 12th April, 1823, "Dilata",[3] or, in other words, deferred giving any decision. But on the 23rd May, 1835, having been again consulted by the Bishop of Verona, it distinctly declared that the decree of 1741 is to be followed,[4] though more recently still, on the 23d September, 1837, being asked whether an existing custom of administering pre-consecrated particles at a requiem mass could be permitted, it answered by "Dilata", and a reference to the decree of April, 1823.[5]

It is plain, then, that the question is not yet fully decided. The decree of 1741 is certainly not revoked, but it is evident that the Sacred Congregation is unwilling to enforce it against the authorities opposed to it, and especially that of Benedict XIV.[6]

708. Although the rubric of the missal[7] prescribes

[1] In Gav. l. c n. xxx.
[2] *De Sac. Miss.*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. n. 12.
[3] *In Panorm.*, ad 9, n. 4594.
[4] *In Veronen.*, n. 4753.
[5] *In Mutinen.*, ad iii. n. 4815.
[6] Vid. Gard., *Annot. in Decr. in Panorm.*, n. 4594.
[7] Pars. i. tit. xviii. Rub. 6.

black as the colour for a requiem mass, it may be celebrated also in violet vestments, as appears from a decree of the Sacred Congregation, which asserts that masses for the dead cannot be celebrated: "nisi cum colore nigro "aut saltem violaceo".[1] Cavalieri,[2] commenting on this decree, says that there should be some reasonable cause for using violet instead of black, as *e.g.*, if there were not a sufficient supply of black vestments in a church for a number of priests, who might wish to say mass for the dead at the same time. When the devotion of the Forty Hours is going on in any church on the 2d November, the Sacred Congregation has left it to the choice of the rector or the local superior, whether black or violet vestments are to be used at the office and mass for the dead on that day.[3]

If, on any occasion, violet vestments be used, there is no doubt that communion may be administered with preconsecrated particles.[4] But the Sacred Congregation having been asked whether the custom might be tolerated of using violet vestments in requiem masses, *in order that* communion might be administered, answered "Serventur "rubricæ", which would seem to discountenance the practice.[5]

709. In the present state of the controversy, then, it may be concluded with De Herdt,[6] that where the decree of 1741 has been observed, it should still continue to be

[1] 21 Junii, 1670, *in Oritana*, n. 2504.

[2] Tom. iii. cap. xii. Decr. i. n. iii.

[3] 16 Sept. 1801, *Romana seu Urbis Ecclesiæ St. Ignatii*, ad 2, n. 4477.

[4] St. Lig., n. 249. Dub. 2. Cavalieri, tom. iv. cap. iv. in Decr. vi. n. iv.

[5] 23 Sept. 1837, *in Mutinen.*, Dub. iii. ad 2, n. 4815.

[6] Par. ii. n. 28. iv.

observed, for it has never been revoked; but where the custom of giving communion at requiem masses with pre-consecrated particles exists, it may still be followed.[1]

Where the custom exists, then, the fact of celebrating in black vestments does not prevent one from giving communion at mass, with pre-consecrated particles. But where the decree is observed, communion with pre-consecrated particles must be administered before or after mass, and with the ceremonies prescribed for communion "extra missam".[2]

710. It is strictly prohibited to give communion at the midnight mass of Christmas, or at any other time during the night. Nor can the other two masses be celebrated immediately after the midnight mass. The priest must wait for the aurora before he can celebrate the second. All this has been decided by decrees of the Sacred Congregation;[3] also by a decree of Clement XI.;[4] but, in some cases, special indults have been granted, permitting communion at this midnight mass. Such was that granted to the Ursuline Nuns of Goritia.[5] Others, of a recent date, are mentioned in the "Analecta Juris Pontificii".[6]

711. The rubric of the missal for Holy Thursday,[7] by directing that some consecrated particles be reserved, if

[1] Cfr. Gardellini, *in Annotat. cit.* n. 4594. [2] Vid. infra, § xvi.

[3] 20 April, 1641, *in Pisauren.*, n. 1319; 7 Decr. 1641, *Trium Miss. in Natal. Domini*, n. 1360; 16 Feb., 1781, *in una Ordinis Carm. Excalc. Cong. Hisp.*, ad 7 et 8, n. 4401.

[4] 18 Dec. 1702, cit. ap Merati, pars. iv. tit. iii. *De Natal. Domini*, n. xiii. q. v.

[5] 27 Jul. 1720, *in Aquileien.*, n. 3940. [6] II^me^ Serie, pag. 1801, etc.

[7] Gavant, pars. iv. tit. viii. rub. 6.

necessary, *for the sick*, clearly implies that communion is to be administered to no others after the mass of Holy Thursday.[1] It cannot then be administered on Good Friday, except as the viaticum, not even when the feast of the Annunciation falls on that day.[2]

712. According to the ancient discipline, communion was administered at the mass of Holy Saturday to the newly-baptized, as has been said in treating of baptism,[3] and not only to them, but to the faithful generally, according to Merati.[4] An opposite custom, however, was pretty generally introduced, and some authors maintained that communion should not be administered, except to the sick, on Holy Saturday. Benedict XIV.,[5] amongst others, inclined to this opinion, but it was decided by the Sacred Congregation that it might be administered.

There are several decrees on the subject. One of 22d March, 1806,[6] decided that Holy Communion might be administered during mass, and that the communion then received suffices for the fulfilment of the Paschal precept. Another, of the 23d September, 1837,[7] decided that it cannot be administered during mass, unless there be a custom in favour of its being then administered: while another, yet more recent, September 7, 1850,[8] not found in Gardellini, but given amongst the "Decreta Authentica", etc., by Falise,[9] declares that it is not to be administered during

[1] Benedict XIV. *De Sac. Missæ*, lib. iii cap. xvili. n. 14.
[2] Benedict XIV., l. c. Merati, pars. iv. tit. ix. n. lxxviii.
[3] Vid. Supra, n. 441.
[4] Pars. iv. tit. x. *De Sab. Sancto*, n. lvii.
[5] Loc. cit.
[6] *In Tiphernen.*, n. 4499.
[7] *In Mutinen.*, Dub. ii. n. 4815.
[8] *In Veronen.*, ad 15.
[9] V. *Communio*, § i. n. 3.

mass, but may be after mass. To reconcile these decrees, we must suppose that the answer of 1806 is restricted to the case in which there is a custom, such as is mentioned in the question to which the answer is given.[1]

It would seem, therefore, that communion may be freely administered on Holy Saturday after mass, but not during mass, unless there be custom in favour of it. It cannot, however, be administered before mass, as the permission does not extend to this, and the rubrics of the missal clearly suppose that before mass there are no particles consecrated, except those reserved for the sick. Nor is the ciborium brought back to the tabernacle until after mass.[2]

§ XIII.—**Itaque Sacerdos, sumpto sacratissimo Sanguine, antequam se purificet, ponat Particulas consecratas in pyxide, vel, si pauci sint communicandi, super patenam, nisi in principio positæ fuerint in pyxide, et genuflectit, ministro interim faciente Confessionem ut supra.**

713. The ceremonies to be observed in giving communion during mass differ only in a few particulars from those already described. In receiving the precious blood, the priest must be careful that the least drop do not remain near the edge of the chalice, lest it come in contact with the pall, for, having received the precious blood, he immediately covers the chalice with the pall.[3] Then, if the consecrated particles he is to distribute be on the corporal, he genuflects, and puts them into the pyxis, or,

[1] Vid. Decr. in Appendice.
[2] Merati, l. c. n. lxiii.
[3] De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28, i.

if there be only a few, on the patena: and keeping the thumb and index of each hand joined, he again genuflects and (the clerk having in the meantime said the "*Confiteor*", etc.) turns towards the communicants to say the "*Misereatur vestri*", etc., as before. These two genuflections are distinctly prescribed in the missal,[1] though the ritual here seems to prescribe only one.

714. If the particles have been from the commencement in a pyxis beside the chalice, he uncovers the pyxis and genuflects only when he turns to say the "*Misereatur*", etc.[2]

715. If he has consecrated no particles, but has to take the ciborium out of the tabernacle; having placed the chalice a little towards the gospel side and covered it with the pall,[3] he removes, if necessary, the chart or canon, and opens the tabernacle; then genuflects, takes out the ciborium, and places it on the middle of the corporal, shuts the tabernacle, uncovers the ciborium and (the clerk having finished the "*Confiteor*", etc.) genuflects, and turns to say the "*Misereatur*", etc., as before.[4]

§ XIV.—**Postea vertens se ad populum, in cornu Evangelii dicit:** *Misereatur vestri, etc.*, **et eo, quo supra dictum est modo, porrigit communicandis Eucharistiam, incipiens a ministris Altaris si velint communicare.**

716. He proceeds here exactly as in giving commu-

[1] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 6.

[2] Caval., vol. v. cap. xxiv. n. xxviii. Baldeschi, par. i. cap. iii. art. i. n. 6.

[3] Vavass., par. iv. *Manière de donner*, etc., n. 122.

[4] Vavass., ibid. De Herdt, l. c.

nion "extra missam", except that he must keep the thumb and index of each hand joined, and touch nothing with them except the host, until the ablution. Hence, in making the sign of the cross at "*Indulgentiam*", etc., he places the left hand on his breast, so as to have the little finger in contact with it, and the palm horizontal.[1] He also holds the patena or the ciborium "per nodum", between the thumb and index joined, and the other fingers.[2]

717. But if there be a great number of communicants, and if the priest finds it difficult to hold the ciborium with his fingers in this way, he may separate the thumb and index of the left hand, having previously removed the fragments from them with the tongue, or washed them and dried them with the purificator in the manner before prescribed.[3] This is the opinion of Falise, who cites Lohner and Vinitor in favour of it.[4]

718. It is here directed that in giving communion the celebrant is to begin with those who serve at the altar, if they wish to communicate. At a private mass he gives it first to the server,[5] who should present himself on the predella.[6] At a solemn mass he administers it first to the deacon and sub-deacon, then to the priests and, after the priests, to the acolytes.[7]

719. The order to be observed by the clergy in going to communion at solemn mass is as follows. After the "Pax", the clergy who are to receive communion go, two

[1] De Herdt, l. c.
[2] Baldeschi, l. c. n. 7. De Herdt, l. c. [3] Supra, § ix.
[4] *Cours Abrégé*, etc., III^me^ partie, chap. iii. § ii. n. 7.
[5] Sac. Rit. Cong., 13 July, 1668, n. 1607.
[6] De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28, vi. Vid. supra, n. 656.
[7] Vavass., par. v. sect. ii. chap. v. n. 135.

and two, with heads uncovered and hands joined, to the centre of the choir, and there kneel,[1] forming a double line from the altar steps down the centre of the choir.[2] During the "*Confiteor*", which is either sung or said "alta voce", by the deacon,[3] they incline and strike the breast,[4] and remain kneeling till the priest has said the third time "*Domine non sum dignus*", etc. Immediately after the "*Confiteor*", the two acolytes ascend and kneel on the edge of the predella, directly facing each other—one on the epistle and the other on the gospel side—and in this position they hold the communion cloth by the four corners, thus keeping it extended with both hands.[5] At the same time the deacon and subdeacon, being the first to receive communion, kneel on the edge of the predella in front, and it is only when they have taken this position that the acolytes extend the cloth.[6] After receiving communion, the deacon goes to the celebrant's right, and the subdeacon to his left.[7] For this purpose both, after communicating, rise, then the sub-deacon descends to the floor, while the deacon moves to the centre of the step on which he is; and both genuflect at the same time, one behind the other.[8] The deacon then ascends to the predella on the gospel side, taking the end of the communion cloth from the hands of the acolyte as he passes, and immediately returning it, the sub-deacon

[1] Baldeschi, tom. ii. parte 1ª cap. i. art. iv. n. 15.

[2] Manuel des Cérémonies Romaines, Tome 1re par. 4me art. viii. n i.

[3] Merati, pars. ii. tit. x. n. lii. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 54, ii.

[4] Baldes., ibid.

[5] Cær. Epis., lib. ii. cap. xxix. n. 3. Baldeschi, tom. iv. cap. vi. art. ii. n. 13.

[6] Baldes., ibid.

[7] Baldeschi, l. c. n. 14.

[8] Cfr. Merati, l. c. n. li.

doing the same as he ascends on the epistle side.[1] The purification after communion being no longer in use,[2] the sacred ministers remain at the sides of the celebrant, the deacon holding the patena under the chin of each communicant, and the sub-deacon keeping his hands joined.[3]

720. When the celebrant is giving communion to the deacon, the clergy rise from their knees, and the first two genuflect on the floor, at the same time that the deacon and sub-deacon genuflect before going to the sides of the celebrant. They then ascend and kneel on the edge of the predella. Having communicated, they rise up, and separate, each making a single step, one towards the gospel, and the other towards the epistle corner. Then turning round, one by his right, and the other by his left, so as not to turn their backs to the Blessed Sacrament, they both descend to the floor, while the two next, having previously genuflected, ascend between them to the predella. According to the "Manuel"[4] the second two genuflect at the same time with the first two, and are thus ready to ascend at once as the others descend.

Having reached the floor, the first two again turn to the altar, and genuflect at the same time, and in the same line, with the third two, and then retire to their places. The second two act in like manner, genuflecting with the fourth two, and so on.[5]

The priests communicate immediately after the sacred ministers, and are required to wear stoles, as explained in a preceding rubric.[6] If there be not a sufficient number

[1] Manuel, l. c. n. viii.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 650.
[3] Merati, l. c. n. liv.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Bald., tom. ii. cap. i. art. iv. n. 15.
[6] Supra, n. 676.

of stoles of the proper colour to allow each priest to have one, there should be at least four. Then the first two could give theirs to the third two after genuflecting with them, the second two to the fourth, and so on.

Should there be more than form the double line from the altar to the limits of the choir, the rest should remain in their places until some have communicated, when they can go and join the line at the end.[1]

721. When there is a general communion at low mass, the ceremonies to be observed are nearly the same. The "Pax" not being given, the clergy take their places in the centre as soon as the priest has said the "*Domine non sum dignus*", etc., before his own communion. The first two rise and ascend to kneel on the edge of the predella, at the same time that the clerks spread the communion cloth; but the rest remain on their knees till the priest has said the third time "*Domine non sum dignus*", etc., when they rise, and the ceremony proceeds as above.

722. After communion, each one returns to his place in choir, and there, according to Baldeschi,[2] conforms in posture to the rest of the clergy. This posture should be kneeling as long as the celebrant is giving communion. The "Ceremoniale Episcoporum"[3] says that those of the clergy who do not communicate remain standing during the "*Confiteor*". But even they should go on their knees when the priest, after the "*Indulgentiam*", etc., turns to the communicants, saying "*Ecce Agnus Dei*", and should remain on their knees while he is giving com-

[1] Manuel, l. c. n. i.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Loc. cit.

munion, as may be inferred from the same authority,[1] and as was decided by the Sacred Congregation.[2]

723. If the "Communio" be sung while the priest is still administering the sacrament, as it may be according to the rubric of the missal,[3] the clergy rise and stand when the singing commences. Another rubric[4] allows them to sit during the singing of this antiphon. But this is to be understood, according to Gavantus,[5] not of the case in which the antiphon is sung while the priest is still giving communion, for then they should stand out of reverence for the Blessed Sacrament; but of the case in which it is sung, as it usually is, while the celebrant is taking the ablutions. The "Manuel des Cérémonies "Romaines"[6] recommends that the antiphon be not commenced until the celebrant is *nearly* done giving communion, so that it may not be concluded before the Blessed Sacrament is put into the tabernacle, otherwise the clergy would be obliged again to kneel.

§ XV.—**Finita Communione, revertitur ad Altare, nihil dicens, et non dat eis benedictionem, quia illam dabit in fine Missæ. Deinde dicit secreto:** *Quod ore sumpsimus, etc.*, **ut in Missali, se purificat, et Missam absolvit.**

724. He returns to the altar, observing what is before directed,[7] but he does not say the "*O Sacrum*", etc., or any other prayer, except "*Quod ore sumpsimus*", etc., as

[1] Chap. xxx. n. 5 in fine.
[2] 9 Mar., 1711, *in Catanien.* ad 3, n. 3834. Vid. Baldes., tom. ii. cap. i. art. ii. n. 5 in nota.
[3] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 9.
[4] Pars. i. tit. xvii. n. 7.
[5] In Loc. litera c.
[6] Loc. cit. n. x.
[7] Supra, n. 694.

marked in the missal. If no particles remain, he does not genuflect on returning, but if any remain, he immediately genuflects, placing his hands on the corporal, and if they are not to be reserved, he consumes them reverently:[1] if they are to be put into the tabernacle, he covers the pyxis (keeping the thumb and index, however, still united), puts it into the tabernacle, genuflects, and then closes the tabernacle.[2]

If there be no tabernacle on the altar, so that the pyxis must be left on the corporal, to be afterwards removed, the priest should be careful to observe the reverences prescribed by the missal for the case in which the pyxis containing the Blessed Sacrament remains on the altar till the end of mass.[3]

Should the particles have been placed on the corporal, and administered from the patena, he must now carefully collect with the patena the fragments that may remain on the corporal, and put them into the chalice, as is directed by the rubric of the missal.[4]

If he has to purify the ciborium, he will do so in the manner before explained.[5]

725. He gives no benediction here, as he is to give it at the end of mass before the last gospel. The words of the rubric seem to imply that in no case should the communicants be allowed to depart without the benediction, and this was the chief ground on which Gavantus,[6] who is here followed by Baruffaldi,[7] maintained that communion

[1] De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28. i.
[2] De Herdt, ibid.
[3] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 7. Vid. Gav. in loc. lit. (b).
[4] Loc. cit. n. 6.
[5] Supra, n. 622. iv.
[6] Pars. ii. tit. x. n. 6. lit. (n).
[7] Tit. xxiv. n. 86.

should not be given at a requiem mass, since there is no benediction at the end of it, as in other masses. We have already seen, however, that communion may be given at a requiem mass,[1] but no benediction is to be given, as the rubric does not permit it.[2]

§ XVI.—**Quod si contingat, absoluta Missa, statim aliquos interdum communicare, tunc Sacerdos adhuc planeta indutus sacram Communionem eo modo, quo supra dictum est, ministrabit.**

726. When communion is administered immediately after mass, and before the priest returns to the sacristy, he retains all the vestments; not only the chasuble, as is here expressly stated, but the maniple also.[3] After purifying the chalice, he places it on the corporal, which he leaves on the centre of the altar, merely turning up the first fold. Having finished mass, he returns to the centre, removes the chalice covered with its veil from the corporal, and places it on the gospel side, spreads out the corporal, opens the tabernacle, and proceeds, as before directed, in giving communion "extra missam".

After the benediction, which he gives in the manner above explained,[5] although the communicants have already received the benediction at mass,[6] he folds the corporal, and puts it into the burse, which he places over the veil of the chalice, and carrying all in the usual way, returns to the sacristy.

[1] Supra, n. 706 et seq. [2] Rub. Miss., pars. ii. tit. xii. n. 4.
[3] Catal., tit. iv. cap. ii. § xi. n. iv. Baruff., n. 87. Caval., cap. iv. Decr. xiii. n. i. [4] Caval., l. c. n. ii. [5] Supra, n. 700.
[6] Caval., l. c. Merati, pars. ii. tit. x. n. xxxiii.

727. As the rubric here is perfectly general, it might seem that communion may be given in the same way immediately after a requiem mass; and in fact Cavalieri is of opinion that it may, if the particles have been consecrated at the mass,[1] and that even the benediction may be given;[2] but a decree of the Sacred Congregation[3] expressly forbids the benediction, although it seems to allow the communion.

It is the more common opinion, however, that communion cannot be given in black vestments, unless strictly "intra missam". If it be deferred till after mass, the priest should lay aside the black vestments, and put on over his alb (or over a surplice if he has laid aside the alb), a stole of the colour suited to the office of the day.[4] He then proceeds as in giving communion "extra missam".

728. If communion be given immediately before mass, the priest comes from the sacristy fully vested, and carrying the chalice as usual. Having ascended to the middle of the altar, he puts the chalice a little to the gospel side, and spreads out the corporal on the centre, then opens the tabernacle, etc., etc., proceeding exactly as before directed.[5] He gives the benediction also, unless it be certain that all the communicants will remain till the end of mass.[6]

729. If the tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacra-

[1] Cap. iv. in Decr. vi. n. viii. [2] In Decr. xiii. n. iii.
[3] 24 Julii, 1683, *in Albinganen*, ad 2, n. 3025.
[4] Merati, l. c. n. xxxi. Benedict XIV., *De Miss. Sacrif.*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. n. 12. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 249, Dub. 3. De Herdt, pars. ii. n. 28. v. Vid. supra, n. 658. [5] Supra, n. 668 et seq.
[6] De Herdt, l. c. Caval., in Decr. x. n. iii.

ment be on an altar different from that at which the mass is celebrated, and if the priest be required for a just reason to give communion in any church, immediately before, or immediately after mass, he may stop for the purpose on his way from or to the sacristy, at the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, and retaining all the vestments, proceed as above, provided there be a custom of doing so in that church. It was expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation[1] that a usage of this kind might be tolerated.

Where there is no such usage, the priest may find it convenient, in the circumstances, to give communion, vested in alb and stole. If before mass, he should of course return to the sacristy to put on the maniple and chasuble, and bring the chalice. If after mass, he should have returned to lay aside these vestments and to leave the chalice.

[1] 12 Mart, 1836, *in Trident.*, ad 12, n. 4777.

CHAPTER XIII.

ON THE PASCHAL COMMUNION.

DE COMMUNIONE PASCHALI.

§ I.—**Curet autem Parochus, ut in Quadragesima per se, vel per alios concionatores populo opportune denuntietur Constitutio Concilii Lateranensis sub Innocentio III., quæ sic habet.**

Omnis utriusque sexus Fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio Sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi pœnitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha, Eucharistiæ Sacramentum, nisi forte de consilio proprii Sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum: alioquin et vivens ad ingressu Ecclesiæ arceatur, et moriens Christiana careat sepultura.

730. It is the duty of the pastor to take care, as he is here directed, that the law of the Church regarding annual communion, as expressed in the decree of the Council of Lateran, be promulgated to his flock. The time of Lent is here mentioned as the time when it ought to be announced to them, because it is the usual time of preparation for complying with the law, and it is, therefore, a suitable time for the pastor himself, or some other preacher under his direction, to address the faithful on the subject.

We have already seen that the pastor must not content

himself with urging on his flock the observance of the decree of Lateran; but should exhort them to receive the Holy Eucharist frequently, and especially on the principal festivals of the year. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, in the passage before cited,[1] gives the practice of the faithful and the laws of the Church, with regard to communion from the very earliest times. It remains for us here to consider the meaning and extent of the law which is at present in force, and what precisely is required for its fulfilment. We shall understand this best by considering: 1° Who are those that are bound by it to receive communion; 2° From whom, or in what place, they are bound to receive it; 3° Within what time they are bound to receive it.

731. I. The terms of the decree appear to be sufficiently explicit on the first question. Every one of the faithful, male or female, who has reached the years of discretion, is bound not only to go to confession, but also to receive Holy Communion. The sole difficulty is in determining what is meant by the years of discretion; but this has been already discussed under a preceding rubric.[2]

732. II. It is necessary to receive the Paschal communion from one's own pastor, or with his permission, otherwise the precept of the Church is not fulfilled.[3] This condition is frequently expressed by saying that each one must communicate in his own parish, but it is always understood that one can satisfy the precept by communicating elsewhere, provided he has the leave of his parish priest.[4]

[1] Supra, n. 577.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 638 et seq.
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 300.
[4] Baruff., tit. xxv. n. 32. St. Lig., l. c.

By the common law, no sacrament can be licitly administered unless by the pastor, or with the consent of the pastor of the person who receives it. This was the case with regard to the Eucharist, as well as to the other sacraments, from the earliest times down to the fifteenth century. Though the regular clergy were allowed to open their churches to the faithful, they were not allowed to administer the Eucharist to them without the consent of the parochial clergy. Sometimes this consent was not asked; sometimes it was unreasonably refused, and as might be supposed, there were many disputes on the subject. Sixtus IV. granted to the Dominicans the privilege of administering the Eucharist to such of the faithful as were unjustly refused it by their parish priest; and from this time various privileges and exemptions were conferred on the religious orders, so that they gradually acquired the right, which they now everywhere enjoy, of administering communion in their churches independently of the parochial clergy.[1]

Moreover, by the custom now universally prevailing, it is understood that any priest who is permitted to say mass, is permitted also to give communion,[2] unless in private oratories, in which, according to a constitution of Benedict XIV.,[3] the celebrant cannot give communion without the leave of the bishop.[4]

733. All this, ho[illegible]ust be understood of communion received thro[illegible]on; for the communion that

[1] Vid. Mel. Th[illegible]ie, 2me Cahier, p. 227-233.
[2] St. Lig., n. 2[illegible] [3] 2 Junii, 1751. *Magno cum*, § 23.
[4] Vid. St. Li[illegible]us finem. *Quæres hic.* Bouix, *D*
cho, pars. iv[ta].

is of precept—that is to say, the Paschal Communion and the Viaticum—can be lawfully administered only by the parish priest or with his permission.[1] So strictly is the right of administering the Paschal Communion reserved to the parochial clergy, that communion, even on Easter day, received without their consent, would not fulfil the precept of the Church.[2] The opposite doctrine, maintained by some authors, is called by Benedict XIV., "falsa nec certe toleranda",[3] being, as he adds, plainly contrary to the decree of Lateran and to the apostolic constitutions, which, in conferring privileges on regulars respecting the administration of the Eucharist, have expressly excepted the Paschal Communion.

It is true that regulars, in virtue of their privileges, can administer communion in their churches, even during Paschal time, except Easter Sunday alone; but the communion thus administered does not satisfy the precept. Both points have been expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation of the Council,[4] in two decrees cited by Benedict XIV.[5] It is certain, then, that the communion by which the precept is fulfilled must be received in the parochial church, or, if elsewhere, with the consent of the pastor. It does not suffice to receive it even in the cathedral, for those who do not belong to the cathedral parish, unless they receive it from the hand, or with the consent of their own parish priest or of the bishop.[6]

[1] St. Lig., n. [illegible]t n. 300.

[2] St. Lig., n. 300.

[3] *De Syn.* [illegible]x. cap. xvi. n. 5.

[4] 11 Jun. [illegible] Jan., 1682.

[5] Loc. cit. n. 3.

[6] [illegible]. xviii. n. 11. St. Lig., n. 300, *Sed opinio*, in *Eucharistia*, cap. vi. art. ii., *Observanda circa*

734. It is to be observed, however, that to have the consent required in order to fulfil the precept out of one's own parish, it is not necessary to ask it for every year, or for every individual case. A well-known and recognized custom in any parish or diocese would be sufficient evidence of it. It may be sometimes also presumed, and Bouvier[1] holds as certain the opinion of St. Liguori, who with Suarez, Lugo, and others whom he cites, teaches that it suffices if the consent can be presumed with moral certainty.[2]

It is, of course, to be understood that the consent of the bishop, or his vicar-general, suffices as well as that of the parish priest.[3] Under the general name of "pastor", in truth, we are to understand the Pope in the Universal Church, and the bishop in his diocese, as well as the parish priest in his parish.[4]

735. There is a special difficulty about strangers, which we shall discuss below under the rubric referring to them;[5] but we may here say a word regarding one or two classes about whom doubts may occur.

1° Priests satisfy the precept wherever they may be by celebrating mass. But if a secular priest make the Paschal Communion "more laicorum", he must, like others, communicate in the parish where he resides or with the leave of the pastor.[6]

2° Servants in monasteries and religious houses share, according to the Council of Trent, in the privilege which

[1] Loc. cit. 15°.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 300. 4. *Modo adsit* in parenth.
[3] Busemb. apud St. Lig., n. 300.
[4] Vid. supra, n. **102.**
[5] Infra, § iv.
[6] St. Lig., n. 300. Bouvier, l. c. 12°.

exempts the religious from the jurisdiction of the ordinary, provided they be in actual service, residing in the houses of the religious, and living under obedience to them . . "qui actu serviunt, et intra eorum septa ac domos resident, "subque eorum obedientiâ vivunt".[1] These, then, can satisfy the Paschal precept in the churches of the religious, as well as the religious themselves, without any reference to the parish priest. But other secular servants, though they may reside in religious houses, cannot, unless in virtue of some special privilege, such as, according to Lacroix,[2] was granted to the Society of the Jesuits.[3]

3° Students in houses of education conducted by religious, cannot fulfil the Paschal precept in those houses, without the consent of the parish priest. This is the opinion of Cardinal De Lugo,[4] and the same may be inferred from a decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, which expressly excepts the Paschal Communion in the permission given to certain religious to administer sacraments to the boarders in a house of education opened by them.[5] According to another decision of the same Congregation,[6] what is said of students may be applied also to seculars, who choose to reside permanently in religious houses as in places of retreat.[7]

It may be observed, with regard to all these, that the requisite permission is usually granted without difficulty,

[1] Sess. xxiv. cap. xi. *De Reform.*

[2] Lib. vi. pars. i. n. 624. [3] Vid. St Lig., n. 240–10.

[4] *Resp. Moral.*, lib. iv. Dub. xxxiii. n. 9.

[5] Thesaur. Resol., tom. i. pag. 71, cit. apud. Mel. Theol. II^me^ Serie, pag. 262.

[6] Cit. apud. Mel. Theol., l. c. pag. 272.

[7] Cfr. Bouix, *De Parocho*, pars. iv. cap. v. n. iv.

and in most places is understood almost as a matter of course.[1]

736. III. The time within which communion must be received to satisfy the precept of the Church, is the "Paschal time". This is plain enough from the terms of the decree, but all doubt is removed by the practice of the Church herself, as well as by the teaching of her theologians. Any one, then, who wilfully, and without any sufficient reason, neglects to communicate during Paschal time, is guilty of violating the ecclesiastical precept, no matter how often he may have gone to communion before its commencement, or after its close. Even if he went before the commencement of the Paschal time, believing that he should be unable to go during the time, and if it turns out afterwards that he can go, he is still bound to go.[2] In a word, the obligation is annexed to the Paschal time, although, as we shall see, it is not strictly confined to it.

737. The Paschal time, according to the declaration of Eugene IV., in the bull "*Fide digna*", commences on Palm Sunday and terminates on Low Sunday, both included; but the time for fulfilling the precept may be extended by necessity, custom, or privilege.[3] The time in Ireland, by a special indult of the Holy See,[4] extends from Ash Wednesday until the octave of the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul;[5] in England by a similar indult,[6] from

[1] Cfr. Bouvier, l. c. n. 13°. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 223.
[2] St. Lig., n. 297 in fine. Bouvier, l. c. 10°.
[3] St. Lig., n. 296.
[4] 4 May, 1851.
[5] Syn. Thurl., Appendix i.
[6] 14 May, 1853.

Ash Wednesday till Low Sunday;[1] and in America, from the first Sunday of Lent till Trinity Sunday.[2]

738. It is a question amongst theologians, whether one who has not communicated during the Paschal time, is bound to communicate as soon as possible afterwards, or, at least, bound to communicate within that year.

Saint Antonine, Soto, Sylvius, and others cited by St. Liguori,[3] maintain that the obligation in each year is annexed to the Paschal time, in the same way as the obligation of hearing mass is annexed to Sunday, and that, therefore, the obligation ceases as soon as the time to which it is annexed is past. They deny, therefore, that one who has not communicated during Paschal time this year, is bound by the law of the Church to communicate sooner than Paschal time next year, any more than one who has neglected to hear mass on a Sunday, is bound to hear mass sooner than the next Sunday or festival. St. Liguori[4] thinks this opinion not quite improbable, "non "contemnendam". Of course, even in this opinion, the case of one who defers his communion by the advice of his confessor is to be excepted, for, according to the terms of the Lateran decree, he is plainly bound to communicate at the time which his confessor may determine.[5]

739. The more common opinion—that which is held by Suarez, De Lugo, Benedict XIV., and others cited and followed by St. Liguori[6]—maintains that the precept

[1] Synod. Westm. I^m, Appendix, pars. i. n. xiii.
[2] Indult, 16 Oct., 1830. Concil. Prov. I^m Baltimor., pag. 92.
[3] Lib. vi. n. 297, *Tertia Sententia.* [4] Loc. cit.
[5] St. Lig., ibid. Billuart, *De Eucharistia*, Dissert. vi. art. i. § iii. petes 2°. Bouvier, l. c. 7°. [6] Loc. cit. *Prima Sententia.*

of the Church is in reality two-fold—imposing the obligation, 1° of communicating in Paschal time; and 2° of communicating, at least, once within the year, as is inferred from the words of the Council of Trent.[1] The fulfilment of the first obligation is necessarily a fulfilment of the second, as is plain; but if one fails to comply with the first, he is still, they say, bound by the second.

740. The ecclesiastical precept, by requiring communion at least once a year, only determines, according to many, how often it must be received in order to comply with the divine precept, Christ having left this to be determined by the Church.[2] Now, if this be assumed, it is plain that one who does not communicate in Paschal time, is still bound by the divine precept, as well as by the ecclesiastical precept which determines it, to communicate within the year. But all do not admit that the ecclesiastical precept is thus a determination of the divine. It is, indeed, admitted by all, that one who complies with the ecclesiastical precept, is sure of communicating as often as he is required by the divine,[3] but many deny that the divine precept requires annual communion. It is denied by those who maintain the above opinion of St. Antonine, and who are cited by St. Liguori.[4] Suarez also, who appears to be cited by St. Liguori in favour of his own opinion, says that the divine precept *per se* requires communion only "aliquoties in vita, saltem "tertio, vel quarto quoque anno".[5]

[1] Sess. xiii. can. 9. Vid. St. Lig., l. c.
[2] St. Lig., n. 297. De Lugo, Disp. xvi. sect. ii. n. 28.
[3] St. Lig., n. 295. Billuart, l. c. § ii. petes 2°.
[4] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 297. *Tertia Sententia.*
[5] Disp. lxix. sect. iii. n. 6.

But the precept of the Church, whether it be looked on as in any sense a determination of the divine precept or not, is almost universally regarded as imposing the two-fold obligation above mentioned, and, therefore, as requiring one who has not communicated in Paschal time, to communicate at least within the year. There still, however, remains a question of great importance in practice—viz.: is he bound to communicate *as soon as possible* after the Paschal time?

741. For sake of greater precision in treating this question, it must be observed, that there are three modes of computing the year of obligation. According to the first, it coincides with the civil year, commencing with January and ending with December. According to the second, it is to be reckoned simply from the last communion. According to the third and most common, it is reckoned from the commencement of the Paschal time in one year, to the commencement of the Paschal time in the next year.[1]

If the first mode of reckoning, which is that of De Lugo,[2] be adopted, and if we suppose that the person has communicated between the first of January and the commencement of the Paschal time, the question proposed must, we think, be answered in the negative, for there is no reason or authority requiring him to communicate again within the year, unless in the Paschal time, which the question supposes to be now past. The reasoning of St. Liguori, and the authorities he cites,[3] proceeds on the sup-

[1] Bouvier, l. c. *Observanda circa Com. Pasch.* 1°.

[2] Disp. xvi. sect. iv. n. 69.

[3] Loc. cit. *Prima Sententia.*

position that the person has not yet complied with the obligation of annual communion. If we suppose that he has not communicated between the 1st of January and the commencement of the Paschal time, even still, De Lugo[1] answers the question in the negative, and maintains that when the Paschal time is elapsed, there remains no other obligation than that of communicating before the end of the year.

742. According to the second mode of computation, to answer the question, we have only to inquire how long it is since his last communion. If it be less than a year, if, *e.g.*, he has received communion on the feast of All Saints last preceding, he is not bound to receive again until the feast of All Saints next succeeding. The Paschal time being past, he cannot comply with the obligation annexed to it—and the only obligation that remains is, that he shall not defer his next communion beyond a year from his last. This is the opinion of Billuart[2] and of Cardinal Gousset.[3] But if a year or more has elapsed since his last communion, he is now bound to communicate as soon as possible, and is guilty of grievous sin, as often as he deliberately neglects an opportunity of doing so.[4]

743. The third is the most correct mode of computing, according to the common opinion of theologians, and according to the custom now generally received.[5] This being supposed, it is plain that one who has not communicated during Paschal time, has not yet complied with

[1] Loc. cit.
[2] Loc. cit. § iii. Petes 2°. *Supponit responsio.* [3] Vol. ii. n. 222.
[4] Gousset, ibid. Billuart, ibid.
[5] St. Lig., n. 296.

the obligation of receiving within the year, which commences with Paschal time. The sole question then is, whether the precept of the Church binds him to receive as soon as possible, in order to comply with this obligation, so that he would be guilty of grievous sin as often as he deliberately omits to avail himself of an opportunity of receiving that may be presented to him. The more common and the more probable opinion, according to St. Liguori, who cites Suarez, Vasquez, Lacroix, etc., in favour of it,[1] affirms that the precept of the Church *does* so bind. The precept, they say, imposes the obligation of communicating in Paschal time, not intending to affix the obligation to the time, so that it would cease when the time expires, but intending, by determining a certain time, to stimulate the faithful to comply with the obligation within that time, and not defer it longer: "non ad "finiendam sed ad solicitandam obligationem".[2]

744. Cardinal De Lugo, however, denies that the precept of the Church binds in this manner, and contends that one who has omitted to communicate in Paschal time, is not bound to communicate as soon as possible, but merely to communicate before the close of the year. Of the two obligations imposed by the precept, the first has been violated, and cannot now be fulfilled; and there remains only the second, which, according to him, is fulfilled by communicating any time before the close of the year, that is, in his reckoning, before the end of December.[3] Hence, *e.g.*, if a person omits to go to communion

[1] Lib. ii. n. 297, *Prima Sententia*.

[2] St. Lig., l. c. Suarez, Disp. lxx. sect. ii. n. 6.

[3] Disp. xvi. sect. iv. n. 69.

in Paschal time, 1866, he would still satisfy the annual precept by communicating on the 31st December, even though he had not been at communion since Paschal time 1865. Cavalieri adopts the very same view, only that he reckons the year of obligation from Pasch to Pasch. According to him, if one, *e.g.*, omits to go to communion in Paschal time, 1866, he would still comply with the annual precept by going before the end of Paschal time, 1867, which would allow a still greater interval.[1]

745. In practice we should not like to recede from the opinion of St. Liguori, and the other great authorities whom he cites, especially as this opinion seems to be sustained by the next rubric.[2] At the same time it can hardly be doubted that the opinion of Billuart and Gousset[3] is solidly probable, and hence, if, *e.g.*, a person went to communion immediately before the commencement of Paschal time, and (culpably or inculpably) omitted to receive during Paschal time, we would not pronounce him guilty of violating the precept of the Church as often as, after Paschal time, he would decline an opportunity offered him of receiving, *provided he does not defer his communion beyond a year from the last.* In favour of this opinion, besides the authority of those who hold it in distinct terms, we have the authority of De Lugo and Cavalieri,[4] who go farther, since they would allow him to defer his communion till the end of the year of obligation, no matter how long it may have been since

[1] Vol. iv. cap. ii. in Decr. xviii. n. viii. et ix.
[2] Infra, § ii. Cfr. Gury, vol. i. n. 481. [3] Supra, n. 742.
[4] Supra, n. 744.

his last, and we have also the authority of those who go yet farther, and deny all obligation for the year, when the Paschal time is once past.[1]

The advantage of adhering in practice to the opinion of St Liguori, is, that it tends to prevent in any case the interval between two communions from exceeding a year. Thus, for example, if a person who omits to communicate this year in Paschal time, has not communicated since Paschal time last year, he is now required, according to this opinion, to communicate "quam primum", while, according to the opinion of De Lugo and Cavalieri, he might now defer his communion till the end of this year, and thus allow an interval of nearly two years to elapse since his last. It is true that St. Liguori's opinion would require him now to communicate "quam primum", even though he had communicated shortly before the beginning of Paschal time. In this, we would follow it only so far as earnestly to exhort him to communicate without delay; but we would not bind him under pain of grievous sin, because, for the reasons already stated, we think the obligation in this case is not sufficiently certain.

746. It may be asked whether one who foresees that he shall be unable to communicate during Paschal time, is bound to anticipate. If Paschal time has already begun, and if he foresees that unless he communicates, *e.g.*, on the second or third day, he shall be unable to communicate at all during Paschal time, he is certainly bound,[2] just as one on a Sunday morning is bound to hear mass, *e.g.*, at eight o'clock, if he foresees that he shall be unable to hear mass at a later hour.

[1] Vid. supra, n. 738.

[2] St. Lig., n. 298 in fine.

By the common law, no sacrament can be licitly administered unless by the pastor, or with the consent of the pastor of the person who receives it. This was the case with regard to the Eucharist, as well as to the other sacraments, from the earliest times down to the fifteenth century. Though the regular clergy were allowed to open their churches to the faithful, they were not allowed to administer the Eucharist to them without the consent of the parochial clergy. Sometimes this consent was not asked; sometimes it was unreasonably refused, and as might be supposed, there were many disputes on the subject. Sixtus IV. granted to the Dominicans the privilege of administering the Eucharist to such of the faithful as were unjustly refused it by their parish priest; and from this time various privileges and exemptions were conferred on the religious orders, so that they gradually acquired the right, which they now everywhere enjoy, of administering communion in their churches independently of the parochial clergy.[1]

Moreover, by the custom now universally prevailing, it is understood that any priest who is permitted to say mass, is permitted also to give communion,[2] unless in private oratories, in which, according to a constitution of Benedict XIV.,[3] the celebrant cannot give communion without the leave of the bishop.[4]

733. All this, however, must be understood of communion received through devotion; for the communion that

[1] Vid. Mel. Theolog., II^me^ Serie, 2^me^ Cahier, p. 227-233.

[2] St. Lig., n. 235. [3] 2 Junii, 1751. *Magno cum*, § 23.

[4] Vid. St. Lig., n. 359, versus finem. *Quæres hic.* Bouix, *De Paroch*, pars. iv^ta^ cap. v. n. vii.

is of precept—that is to say, the Paschal Communion and the Viaticum—can be lawfully administered only by the parish priest or with his permission.[1] So strictly is the right of administering the Paschal Communion reserved to the parochial clergy, that communion, even on Easter day, received without their consent, would not fulfil the precept of the Church.[2] The opposite doctrine, maintained by some authors, is called by Benedict XIV., "falsa nec certe toleranda",[3] being, as he adds, plainly contrary to the decree of Lateran and to the apostolic constitutions, which, in conferring privileges on regulars respecting the administration of the Eucharist, have expressly excepted the Paschal Communion.

It is true that regulars, in virtue of their privileges, can administer communion in their churches, even during Paschal time, except Easter Sunday alone; but the communion thus administered does not satisfy the precept. Both points have been expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation of the Council,[4] in two decrees cited by Benedict XIV.[5] It is certain, then, that the communion by which the precept is fulfilled must be received in the parochial church, or, if elsewhere, with the consent of the pastor. It does not suffice to receive it even in the cathedral, for those who do not belong to the cathedral parish, unless they receive it from the hand, or with the consent of their own parish priest or of the bishop.[6]

[1] St. Lig., n. 240 et n. 300. [2] St. Lig., n. 300.
[3] *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. ix. cap. xvi. n. 5.
[4] 11 June, 1650, et 31 Jan., 1682. [5] Loc. cit. n. 3.
[6] Benedict XIV., *Instit.* xviii. n. 11. St. Lig., n. 300, *Sed opinio*, in parenth. Bouvier, *De Eucharistia*, cap. vi. art. ii., *Observanda circa Com. Pasch.*, 14°.

ful were required to present a certificate of confession before they would be admitted to communion,[1] or the pastor gave a certificate to each one at the time of receiving communion, and after Paschal time went round the houses of his parishioners to collect these certificates.[2] Such means are no longer in use in France,[3] and we believe that at present those certificates of communion are employed in very few if any places out of Italy, where they are still continued.[4] But the pastor is everywhere bound to use such means as prudence may suggest in his circumstances to ascertain the defaulters, and induce them to comply with their obligation.

749. A public exhortation, in general terms, just before the close of the Paschal time, might have the desired effect. If this fails, he should have recourse to private remonstrance. And it is only after such remonstrance has been two or three times repeated without effect, that the rubric requires him to denounce the parties to the ordinary.

But the parish priest cannot go further than this.[5] The penalties mentioned in the decree are only "ferendæ sententiæ", and the parish priest cannot inflict them of his own authority. They can be inflicted only by the authority of the ordinary.[6] Bouvier[7] seems to say that even the denunciation to the ordinary, here mentioned, is no longer in use. It is plainly a matter for the consideration

[1] Bouvier, cap. vi. art. ii., *Observanda circa Com. Pasch.* 17°. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 225.

[2] Baruff., tit. xxv. n. 17.

[3] Bouvier, loc. cit. Gousset, loc. cit.

[4] Analecta, etc., IV^me^ Serie, pag. 2276.

[5] Baruff., n. 21.

[6] St. Lig., n. 295 in fine, et lib. vii. n. 11. Scavini, *De Euch.*, cap. i. art. 8. Quær. 2.

[7] Loc. cit.

of the bishop, whether it be expedient to insist on it in his diocese or not.

750. The fact that those who do not communicate in Paschal time are, immediately after the expiration of it, urged to communicate under a threat of such severe penalties, appears to be a strong confirmation of the opinion of St. Liguori given above.[1] But De Lugo replies to this argument, that the censures are inflicted, not on account of the refusal to comply with an obligation still urging, but on account of the violation of the precept already committed, the prelate agreeing *not* to inflict the censure (which he might inflict at once according to the words of the decree), provided the person, when admonished, goes to communion.[2] Cavalieri replies to it in the same way.[3]

§ III.—**Dabit quoque operam Parochus, quoad fieri potest, ut in ipso die sanctissimo Paschæ communicent; quo die ipse per se, nisi legitime impediatur, parochiæ suæ Fidelibus hoc Sacramentum ministrabit.**

751. The Paschal time, as above stated,[4] is of fifteen days duration, and by necessity, privilege, etc., generally much longer. But it is the desire of the Church that the faithful receive holy communion on the very day of the Paschal solemnity, that is to say, on Easter Sunday, and that the parish priest himself administer it on that day, unless there be a just reason to prevent him. In populous parishes, where the number of clergy is small, it would be impossible to give all an opportunity of confessing, so that they might be able to communicate on Easter Sun-

[1] Supra, n. 743.
[2] Disp. xvi. n. 70-73.
[3] Vol. iv. cap. ii. Decr. xviii. n. vii.
[4] Supra, n. 737.

day. Other reasons, too, might make it inconvenient for some to receive communion on that day, and of course there may be sufficient reasons to prevent the pastor himself from administering it. The rubric, accordingly, is not preceptive, but merely expresses a desire that the pastor will do what he can to administer communion to his flock on this great solemnity.

752. The more effectually to guard against any interference with him, the Holy See, in the privileges by which religious are permitted to give communion during Paschal time, always excepts Easter day,[1] so that on Easter day they cannot distribute communion to the people in their churches unless by the permission of the parish priest or of the ordinary. Not only, then, are the faithful bound to communicate in their own parish, in order to fulfil the Paschal precept, but it seems to be the wish of the Church that on Easter day they should not, even through devotion, communicate elsewhere.

§ IV.—**Alienæ vero Parochiæ Fideles ad proprium Parochum remittet, præter peregrinos et advenas, et qui certum domicilium non habent, quibus ipse sacram præbebit Communionem, si accesserint rite parati; vel ubi est ea consuetudo, eos ad Cathedralis Ecclesiæ Parochos remittet.**

753. The rubric here directs that strangers are not to be admitted to holy communion, but are to be sent or referred to their own pastors. This applies not only to Easter day, but to the whole Paschal time, because, as we have seen,[2] each one must communicate in his own parish, or at least have the leave of his parish priest, in order to

[1] Cfr. Benedict XIV., *De Syn. Dioc.*, Lib. ix. cap. xvi. n. 3.

[2] Supra, n. 732.

fulfil the Paschal precept. St. Charles[1] ordered that in Paschal time, as often as communion is administered, notice be given of this obligation, so that strangers who might be present would know what is required of them in order to fulfil the precept of the Church. This is the proper course, and in populous parishes the only effectual course, for the parish priest could hardly know personally who the strangers are amongst so many. Besides, it would be extremely inconvenient, and, considering present usages, we doubt if it would be allowable, to exclude individuals who might present themselves at the rails, on the ground that they are strangers to the parish.

754. Bouvier[2] and Gousset[3] observe that at present communion is freely administered to strangers as well as the rest, because it is presumed that they have already complied with the Paschal precept in their own parish, or that they intend yet to do so, or that they have the permission of their own pastor. This may be very justly presumed in places where the people are sufficiently instructed in the obligation of the Paschal precept, or where there is an understanding about the matter amongst the parochial clergy.

755. But independently of all custom or arrangement on the subject, there are certain classes here mentioned by the rubric to whom the parish priest can give communion, and who satisfy the precept by this communion, though they do not belong to his parish. These are "peregrini", "advenæ", and those who have no fixed

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Concil. Prov. ii. tit. i. Decr. xii. pag. 53.
[2] *De Eucharistia*, observanda circa Com. Pasch., n. 17.
[3] Vol. ii. n. 224.

domicile, usually called "vagi". The words "peregrini" and "advenæ" are used by most authors in the very same signification, viz., as meaning those who are absent from the place of their domicile, without determining how long or how short a time. They are so used by Suarez,[1] Ferraris,[2] St. Liguori,[3] etc.

756. Some, however, distinguish them. By a "peregrinus" they understand one who has a fixed domicile and intends to return to it, but is for the present living in another place, where he intends to stay only a short time, less than half a year at the utmost. By "advena" they understand one who, having left the place of his domicile, if he has one, comes to another with the intention of remaining there for at least the greater part of a year. This appears to be the distinction made by Bouvier[4] and Scavini.[5] According to this distinction, an "advena" is one who has acquired at least a quasi-domicile in the place where he is.[6] By "vagi" all understand those who have no fixed domicile, but go from place to place.

757. Baruffaldi[7] seems to suppose that the words "qui certum domicilium non habent", qualify "peregrinos et advenas", and understands the rubric therefore to speak here of "vagi" exclusively, as, in the first clause, it directs that strangers who have a domicile be sent to their own parish. This, however, restricts the meaning too much. The rubric, according to this explanation, would make no provision for those who are at a great distance from the place of their domicile, and who could not therefore with-

[1] *De Legibus*, lib. iii. cap. xxxiii.
[2] Verb. *Lex.* art. iii. n. 28 et seq. [3] Lib. i. n. 156.
[4] *De Legibus*, cap. v. art. v. [5] *De Legibus*, cap. v. art. ii. Qu. 3.
[6] Vid. St. Lig., l. c., *Ille autem acquirit*, etc. [7] Tit. xxv. n. 36.

out great inconvenience, or perhaps could not at all, go back to it, during the Paschal time. Besides the "et" shows that the "**qui certum domicilium non habent**" are distinct from those mentioned before. By "peregrinos et advenas", then, are most probably meant strangers from a distant place. Those from a neighbouring parish would hardly be called by these names, and at all events are manifestly to be understood as comprehended in the first clause, which directs them to be sent back to their own parish priest.

758. If those strangers acquire a quasi-domicile in the parish, or if they be "advenæ" in the sense above explained,[1] they not only are at liberty to make their Paschal communion in the parish, but, according to a general principle of law,[2] they are bound to make it there like the rest of the inhabitants, unless they choose to go back and make it in the parish of their domicile.[3]

759. If they have not acquired a quasi-domicile, in other words, if they be "peregrini" in the sense above explained,[4] but cannot conveniently go to the place of their domicile, they can satisfy the precept by receiving in the parish where they are. This we think is plainly implied in the present rubric, and at all events it is the common doctrine of theologians.[5] The same is to be said of "vagi" or those who have no domicile.[6] But it may still be a question whether or no both these classes are bound like the other inhabitants to receive communion from the parish priest, or with his permission. Many authors cited by St. Liguori maintain that they are; but

[1] Supra, n. 756. [2] St. Lig., lib. i. 156. *Dubit.* 1.
[3] Vid. Mel. Theol., II^me^ Serie, 2^me^ Cahier, pag. 273.
[4] Supra, n. 756. [5] St. Lig., n. 300, . . . [2] in parenth. [6] St. Lig., ibid.

St. Liguori himself gives it as the most common opinion, that they are not, and that they can satisfy the precept by communicating in the churches of religious.[1] This decision of St. Liguori is combated by the "Melanges Theologiques;"[2] but whatever may be said of the grounds on which it rests, it is sufficient to justify any one who resolves to act on it, for, after all, there is question merely of interpreting a positive law of the Church.

760. In some places these "peregrini" and "vagi" may be required to go to communion during the Paschal time in the cathedral church. By the decree of St. Charles above cited,[3] they were required to do so in the city of Milan, but not in other parts of the diocese. Where such a custom exists, the rubric here wishes it to be respected, but the words do not convey that a compliance with the custom is necessary to fulfil the Paschal precept.[4]

§ V.—**In cæteris vero servabit ea, quæ in libro de statu animarum, ut infra, præscribuntur.**

761. He must carefully observe what is prescribed as to the manner of entering the names, and noting the sacraments received, in the "Liber de statu animarum". It should contain the names of all his parishioners, divided into families, the names of the members of each family being written together, as is directed in the ritual hereafter. He should note after each name whether the person has received holy communion. The sacraments of which the reception is to be marked in this book are, Confirmation and the Eucharist. The reception of the other sacraments is noted in other books.

[1] Lib. vi. n. 240, v. 9.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Supra, n. 753.
[4] Baruff., n 41.

The ritual does not require him to enter the names of strangers in the "Liber statûs animarum", unless when they live in the family of a parishioner. But it would be well to note in it, or in some other book, if he can conveniently, the names of strangers to whom he gives communion in Paschal time, as they may wish him to certify that they received it.

§ VI.—Ægrotis quoque Parochialibus, etiamsi Communionem extra præscriptos Paschales dies sumpserint, in Paschalibus diebus illam deferet ac ministrabit.

762. The sick who are unable to go to the parish church, are still bound to comply with the Paschal precept, if the opportunity be given them;[1] and the pastor is here directed to give them the opportunity, by bringing the Blessed Sacrament to them within the Paschal time. The rubric directs this to be done, even though they may have received communion shortly before the beginning of the Paschal time, for that communion does not fulfil the precept.[2] But if the priest has reason to believe that a sick person will be able shortly after the close of the Paschal time to receive communion in the church, he can extend the time for him.

763. One who receives the viaticum during Paschal time, does not, according to Cavalieri,[4] thereby fulfil the Paschal precept, which is distinct from that of the viaticum. But it is much more probable that by the same communion he satisfies both precepts.[5]

[1] Baruff., n. 52. [2] Vid. supra, n. 736.
[3] Catal., tit. iv. cap. iii. u v. n. ii. Gousset, vol. ii. n. 220.
[4] Vol. iv. cap. ii. in Decr. xxxiv. n. vi.
[5] Gousset, l. c. Gury, pars. i. n. 484, Quær. 8°.

CHAPTER XIV.

ON COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

DE COMMUNIONE INFIRMORUM.

§ I.—Viaticum Sacratissimi Corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi summo studio ac diligentia ægrotantibus opportuno tempore procurandum est, ne forte contingat illos tanto bono, Parochi incuria, privatos decedere.

764. Whatever contributes to give spiritual strength or comfort to the dying, was by many of the holy fathers and other ancient writers called a "viaticum", since it prepares them for the passage out of this world into the next, and enables them to make it with greater confidence and security. Hence, not only the Blessed Eucharist, but the other sacraments administered to the dying, and even the prayers offered up, or the good works performed by themselves or by others on their behalf, came under this general designation. But in course of time, the Holy Eucharist came to be regarded as the "Viaticum" by excellence, and according to present use, is exclusively meant by the word.[1] "Sacred writers", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "call it the 'Viaticum', as well be-"cause it is the spiritual food by which we are supported

[1] Vid. Caval., vol. iv. cap. v. *De Com. Infirm.* Catal., tit. iv. cap. iv. § i. n. i. et seq.

" in our mortal pilgrimage, as also because it prepares " for us a passage to eternal glory and happiness".[1]

765. All are bound by divine precept to receive it when in danger of death, as a protection against the assaults of the enemy in the last struggle; and this, according to the more probable opinion, even though one may have communicated a few days before through devotion.[2]

766. It is a question amongst theologians whether one who has communicated in the morning through devotion is bound to receive again " per modum viatici", if danger of death supervenes that day. Some affirm that he is, others that he is not. Of the latter, some say he is free to receive, though not bound; others, that he not only is not bound, but is not permitted, to receive a second time on the same day. Benedict XIV. gives these several opinions, and says the pastor is free to act on any of them.[3] St. Liguori[4] thinks it more probable that one in the circumstances is bound to receive the viaticum if the danger comes from an external cause, as a fall, a violent assault, or the like; for he has not yet complied with the obligation of receiving " in periculo mortis", but not if he were already sick, nor if the danger already existed in some internal though unknown cause, as might be presumed in case of sudden illness, *e.g.*, an attack of apoplexy.

767. The rubric here requires the pastor to take all possible care that the sick may have an opportunity of

[1] Pars. ii. cap. iv. n. 5.
St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 285, Dub. 2. *Secunda Sententia.*
[2] *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. xi. n. 2. [4] *Loc. cit.* Dub. 3.

receiving holy communion in due time, that is, according to Baruffaldi,[1] while they have still the use of their faculties, and can, therefore, receive it with greater fruit. He should prepare them for it, and exhort them to receive it, even when there is no imminent danger of death, because it is the great means of imparting strength and vigour to the soul in the trials and temptations incident to sickness, and because he thus makes sure that they shall not be without this great succour, should the illness suddenly take a fatal turn.

§ II.—**Cavendum autem in primis est, ne ad indignos cum aliorum scandalo deferatur, quales sunt publici usurarii, concubinarii, notorie criminosi, nominatim excommunicati, aut denuntiati, nisi sese prius sacra Confessione purgaverint, et publicæ offensioni, prout de jure, satisfecerint.**

768. Public sinners, such as are here mentioned, must give proofs of sincere conversion before they are admitted to holy communion even in sickness; otherwise great scandal would arise, especially in places where the Blessed Sacrament is carried to the sick in solemn procession, and where consequently their communion becomes known to the whole neighbourhood. When one of this class is visited by the pastor, it is not enough that he goes to confession. He must be required to repair the injuries and scandals of which he has been the cause, as far as his present circumstances permit. It is for the prudent confessor to decide in each case the nature and extent of this obligation. We shall merely observe, that where restitution is to be made, or where the proximate voluntary occasion

[1] Tit. xxvi. n. 10.

of sin is to be removed, and where it is possible that this can be done by the sick man immediately, he should not be absolved, nor consequently admitted to holy communion, until it is done. This is the doctrine of St. Liguori, laid down or supposed by him in several places.[1] In the "Praxis Confessarii",[2] he speaks specially of the sick, but he does not except them anywhere, and it is evident that what he says applies to them as much as to others, when they have it in their power to make the restitution, or to remove the occasion.

769. Of course, if death seems imminent, and there is reason to fear that they may not have time, nothing more can be exacted than a firm purpose of doing what is required of them, should they recover. In the "Modo "Pratico di Assistere A' Moribondi", etc., a litttle book highly prized by the parochial clergy in Italy, it is suggested[3] that one who has to make reparation for public scandal, should be induced to ask pardon of those who may be present in the room after having accompanied the Blessed Sacrament, and to request them to publish the retractation. Where the priest brings the viaticum privately, he can easily introduce a few persons for the purpose, if he thinks it expedient to act on this suggestion.

§ III.—**Hortetur Parochus infirmum, ut sacram Communionem sumat, etiamsi graviter non ægrotet, aut mortis periculum non immineat, maxime si Festi alicujus celebritas id suadeat; neque ipse illam ministrare recusabit.**

770. The rubric everywhere supposes that the viati-

[1] Lib. iv. n. 436 et n. 682. Lib. vi. n. 454. *Praxis Conf.*, ns. 48, 66, et 105.

[2] Cap. vii. n. 105.

[3] Cap. vii. Edit. Roma, 1818.

cum is administered by the parish priest. No other can lawfully administer it without his sanction, except in case of necessity.[1] The pastor, as has been said,[2] should exhort the sick to receive Holy Communion, even when there is no immediate danger of death. The celebration of some festival affords a good opportunity of doing so without exciting fears that might aggravate the disease. He must take care above all not to refuse it to those who are anxious to receive it, especially those who, when in good health, were wont to communicate often.[3]

771. Where the decree of St. Pius V. "*Supra gregem*", etc., is in force, physicians are bound at once to admonish their patients to go to confession, and are obliged to withhold their services after the third day, unless there be proof that they have confessed.[4] At all events, they, and indeed all who are in attendance on the sick, are clearly bound in charity to give them notice when it is ascertained that the disease is likely to be fatal, that they may prepare to receive the last sacraments. The obligation of the pastor to give this notice is strongest of all, since he is bound, *ex officio*, to consult for their spiritual welfare. The notice, however, should be conveyed so as to excite as little alarm as possible, and be accompanied by words of consolation and encouragement.[5]

§ IV.—Pro Viatico autem ministrabit, cum probabile est quod eam amplius sumere non poterit.

772. Communion is to be administered as the viati-

[1] Vid. Lig., lib. vi. n. 235 et seq. [2] Supra, n. 767.

[3] Cfr. *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, para. iv. Instruct. De Visitatione et Cura Infirmorum, § *De Communione*, pag. 445.

[4] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 664.

[5] St. Lig., *Praxis Confessarii*, cap. xi. n. 227 et seq.

cum, when, as is here stated, it is probable that the sick person shall be unable to receive it any more, that is, according to Cavalieri, when he is in probable danger of death. The priest, in administering the Eucharist "pro viatico" or "per modum viatici", uses the form "*Accipe frater*", etc., instead of the ordinary form "*Corpus Domini*", etc.[1] On the words of the present rubric Cavalieri observes: "Verba sunt per quæ instruimur nonnisi "in probabili mortis periculo Eucharistiam per modum "viatici administrandam esse, nempe per illa verba, '*Ac*- "'*cipe frater, Viaticum*', etc., extra vero tale periculum, "semper per consueta "*Corpus Domini*", etc.[2] This then is the rule by which the priest is to be guided as to the form he should use in giving communion to the sick. If the danger be such as to make it probable that the person cannot receive it again, it is to be administered with the form "*Accipe frater*", etc.

773. It matters not whether he be fasting or no. Cavalieri altogether rejects the opinion of those who say that it is to be administered "per modum viatici" only to those who are not fasting: "Sive ægrotus jejunus sit vel non, sem- "per communicat per modum viatici quando ei adminis- "tratur Eucharistia in articulo mortis constituto".[3] It is true that those who are not fasting can receive communion only "per modum viatici";[4] but it does not follow, nor is it true, that they alone can receive it "per modum viatici". On the contrary, the rubric itself, as we shall see,[5]

[1] Vid. infra, § xx.
[2] Cap v. *De Com. Inf.*, Decr. i. n. iv.
[3] Loc. cit. Decr. xi. n. xiv. Cfr. etiam Ferraris, verb. *Viaticum*, n. 6, Edition Migne.
[4] Vid. infra, § viii.
[5] Infra, § vi.

clearly implies that it is desirable that those who receive the viaticum should be fasting.

In a word, it appears from the present rubric that the form to be used is to be determined entirely by the consideration, whether or no the person be at the time in probable danger of death. If he be, then the form should be "*Accipe frater*", etc.; if not, then the form should be the ordinary one. Hence, *e.g.* a criminal about to be executed should receive communion "per modum viatici", and it should, therefore, be administered with the form *Accipe*, etc. This is expressly taught by Cavalieri,[1] and the "Modo Pratico",[2] which adds that it is to be administered to him with this form, even though he be fasting.

§ V.—**Quod si æger, sumpto Viatico, dies aliquot vixerit, vel periculum mortis evaserit, et communicare voluerit ejus pio desiderio Parochus non deerit.**

774. If the sick person, after having received the viaticum, recovers from the danger, or even if he only survives some days, and desires to communicate again, the priest should endeavour to gratify this pious desire. There can be no difficulty about the matter, if he has so far recovered as to be able to receive in the ordinary way, or at least to receive fasting. Clericatus observes that the rubric here supposes him to be able to receive fasting, for it includes the case in which he may have recovered from the danger of death, as is plain from the words "**vel periculum mortis evaserit**", and it does not treat till the next sentence of those to whom it may be administered after

[1] Loc. cit. Decr. ii, n. iii [2] Cap. xiv.

having broken the fast.[1] Cavalieri says, and it seems more probable, that the rubric here altogether prescinds from the question of fasting.[2]

775. If he be unable to receive fasting, theologians commonly require an interval of about eight days before they would permit him again to communicate. But it is a very probable opinion, maintained by many, that communion may be administered the next day, and even every day. "Est sententia valde probabilis et pia", says Cavalieri,[3] using the words of Clericatus,[4] whom he cites, "quod altera die sacro viatico per non jejunum infir-"mum recepto, si duret idem mortis periculum, possit "idem infirmus, etiam non jejunus, sacram Eucharis-"tiam suscipere; et sic quod liceat parocho etiam "quotidie infirmum prædictum, licet non jejunum per "viaticum communicare". Some extend the favour to all who are in danger of death; others restrict it to those who are accustomed to communicate often, and have a great desire of communion.[5]

Gury[6] cites St. Liguori for allowing it to these only twice in the week, but we could not find this restriction in St. Liguori. On the contrary, he seems to us, in the place referred to,[7] to admit as probable that they may be allowed it every day. It is justly observed, however, that it may be more readily permitted whenever the Blessed Sacrament can be brought to the sick without a public

[1] *De Eucharistia*, Decis. xix. Ad Aprilis casum ii. n. 13.
[2] *De Com. Inf.*, Decr. i. n. x.
[3] Loc. cit. n. ix.
[4] Loc. cit. n. 11.
[5] Vid. Caval., loc. cit.
[6] Vol. ii. n. 385.
[7] Lib. vi. n. 285.

procession, as is usually the case, *e.g.* in convents, colleges, etc.[1] Cavalieri thinks there should be no difficulty in allowing it in such cases. He says[2] that the expression of the rubric "**dies aliquot**" (which is one of the chief grounds for requiring an interval of some days) is intended to limit, not the communion of the sick, but the obligation of the pastor to carry the Blessed Sacrament from the church.

776. With regard to the form to be used, if the danger of death be past, the communion should not be given "per modum viatici", and, therefore, should be administered with the ordinary form "*Corpus Domini*", etc. But if the danger still continues, authorities are divided on the point Some say the form to be used is "*Corpus Domini*", etc., because during the same illness, communion, they say, should be administered only once as the viaticum, and, therefore, only once with the form "*Accipe frater*", etc. St. Charles lays down this very distinctly, while recommending what the rubric here prescribes. He says: "....
"ejus pio desiderio Parochus non deerit, sed pro viatico
"illam iterum in eodem morbo non ministrabit ideoque
"ministrando utetur illis verbis, *Corpus*", etc.[3] Catalani cites and adopts these words.[4] The same is taught by Billuart[5] and De Herdt.[6] Bouvier also maintains this opinion: "Ubi infirmitas protrahitur et periculum mortis
"perseverat, Sacra Eucharistia iterum moribundo etiam
"non jejuno . . . dari potest, non per modum viatici, quod
"semel tantum in eadem infirmitate administratur, sed

[1] Gury, loc. cit. [2] Loc. cit. n. x.
Instruct. Visitat. Inf. De Communione, pag. 445.
[4] Cap. iv. § iv. n. ii. [5] Diss. vi. art. iv. § ii. *Dixi*, 4°.
[6] Pars. vi. n. 17. ii.

"modo consueto, ad satisfaciendum devotioni".[1] This weight of authority is plainly sufficient to justify any one who chooses to act on it.

777. But we think it more probable that while the danger continues, the form should always be "*Accipe "frater*", etc. The words of the rubric are very general: **"Pro viatico ministrabit cum probabile est quod eam am- "plius sumere non poterit".** Now, the probability of his being unable to receive it again, which made it be administered as the viaticum the first time, must evidently still continue while the same danger continues. Benedict XIV. clearly supposes this, at least for the case in which the sick person is unable to observe the fast. He says: "Potest et "interdum debet Episcopus constituere ne parochi renuant "SS. Eucharistiam iterato deferre ad ægrotos qui, etiam "perseverante eodem morbi periculo, illam sæpius *per mo- "dum viatici* cum naturale jejunium servare nequeant, per- "cipere cupiant".[2] There is no reason to suppose that the pontiff here restricts the administration "*per modum via- "tici*" to the case in which the fast has been broken. He mentions this case probably because it is of frequent occurrence, and because it is precisely the case in which priests might have a difficulty about administering it more than once. Besides, we have seen that the form to be used is not determined by the fact that a person is fasting or not fasting.[3] The "Modo Pratico" having stated that the viaticum may be administered more than once in the same illness, adds, that the formula "*Accipe frater*" is always to be used.[4] Cavalieri evidently conveys the same in the

[1] *De Euch.*, cap. v. art. ii. § ii.
[2] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. xii. n. 4. [3] Supra, n. 773.
[4] Loc. cit.

passage above cited;[1] for the expression "per viaticum its equivalent is always understood by him to imply the of the words *Accipe frater*, etc.[2]

778. Some theologians taught that the precept o ceiving the viaticum is fulfilled even by a sacrilegious munion.[3] But we have seen before[4] that a similar opi regarding the precept of annual communion was demned by Innocent XI. It is quite certain, there that the precept of receiving the viaticum is not fulfi by receiving it unworthily.[5] But if one who has rece the viaticum with the proper dispositions should fall mortal sin, he is not, according to the more prob opinion, bound to receive it again. It is enough tha goes to confession.[6]

§ VI.—**Potest quidem Viaticum brevi morituris non jejunis: id tamen diligenter curandum est, ne iis buatur, a quibus ob phrenesim, sive ob assiduam tus aliumve similem morbum, aliqua indecentia cum ju tanti Sacramenti timeri potest.**

779. If one who is about to receive the viaticum receive it fasting, he should do so. But if abstinence fi food or medicine be in the least inconvenient to him, i not required, and there should be no scruple or hesitat about acting on this decision.[7]

780. By a usage formerly existing in some places, especially in Spain, criminals condemned to death w

[1] Supra, n. 775. [2] Vid. supra, n. 772.
[3] De Lugo, Disp. xvi. sect. ii. n. 45. [4] Supra, n. 747.
[5] Cfr. Lacroix, lib. ii. pars. i. n. 610, et 617. Bouvier, *De Eucharis* cap. vi. art. i. *Notanda circa Viaticum*, 10°.
[6] St. Lig., n. 293. [7] St. Lig., n. 285, *Hic autem sed*

altogether excluded from Holy Communion. But this usage was condemned as contrary to Christian charity in the Council of Mayence in 847, and afterwards by St. Pius V., in 1569.[1] Many other Councils and Popes are cited by Gousset.[2] Benedict XIV., without formally prohibiting it in places where it may have existed in his time, urges the bishops to introduce the opposite custom.[3] We believe there are now few places where the viaticum is not administered to such persons, as well as to those who are in danger of death from sickness. By a decree of the Congregation of Bishops[4] it was decided that it may be administered to them on the very day on which they are executed.

According to the common opinion of theologians, these, and in general all to whom the Eucharist is administered by way of viaticum, are exempt from the obligation of receiving it fasting, when the fasting is attended with any inconvenience.[5]

781. It is not to be administered in any case in which there is danger of irreverence to the sacrament; and it is for the priest to judge from the circumstances in each case of the danger that exists. It generally arises from some of the causes here mentioned in the rubric.

We have seen that communion cannot be given to one who has never had the use of reason.[6]

[1] Cfr. Baruff., tit. xxvi. 35 et seq. Caval., *De Comm. Infirm.*, Decr. ii. n. i. et seq.

[2] Vol. ii. n. 280.

[3] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. vii. cap. xi. n. 3.

[4] 16 Jun., 1590, apud Caval., l. c. n. ii.

[5] Baruff., n. 43, 44. Caval., l. c. n. iii. St. Lig., l. c. De Lugo, Disp. xv. sec. iii. n. 58. et Disp. xvi. sect. ii. n. 46 in fine.

[6] Supra, n. 635.

If delirium be caused by disease, as in fever, or if the person be subject to passing fits of insanity, the priest should await the return of reason, and be prepared to avail himself of the first favourable moment to administer the sacrament. It may happen, however, that the use of reason is not recovered, or at least is not recovered until the patient is dying and unable to receive communion. If this be apprehended, the viaticum may be administered even during the delirium to those who have led a good Christian life, provided there be no danger of irreverence. This is the common teaching of theologians,[1] and is clearly enough conveyed in the passage before cited[2] from the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

Some would restrict the decision to the case in which the sick person has had the use of his faculties a short time before. But according to De Lugo, there is no reason why it should be thus restricted. No matter what be the duration of the insanity, if when in full possession of his faculties he has lived as a pious Christian, and if there be now no danger of irreverence, the viaticum should be administered to him.[3] It is not, however, to be administered to one who has lost his senses in an evidently impenitent state.[4]

We may observe that in all diseases where there is any reason to apprehend delirium, the priest should endeavour to administer the last sacraments as early as possible.

782. The danger of irreverence may arise from inces-

[1] St. Lig., n. 302. Modo Pratico, cap. vii.

[2] **Supra, n. 635.**

[3] *De Eucharistia*, Disp. xiii. sec. iii. n. 24, et seq.

[4] St. Lig., l. c. Modo Pratico, l. c.

sant coughing, from difficulty of breathing, from difficulty of swallowing, or from frequent vomiting. In all these cases a little food or drink may be given first, to try whether the person can receive without danger of rejecting the Sacred Host. The same may be done in case of delirium also. Many recommend the trial to be made with an unconsecrated particle.[1] This undoubtedly would be a very secure test, but notice should be given lest it might be mistaken for the sacrament.

With regard to cough, it may be observed that if it be not so continuous as to prevent swallowing, the viaticum may be given, for although expectoration may immediately follow, the phlegm thrown off does not come from the œsophagus or passage to the stomach, but from the trachea or passage to the lungs, and there is, consequently, no danger of the Sacred Host being rejected.[2] If it be ascertained that, from the parched state of the palate, or from any other cause, the sick person might have a difficulty in swallowing the Sacred Host, a little wine or water may be given immediately before or after, or, if necessary, a very small particle may be put into a little wine or water, and administered in this way.[3]

In case of vomit, the sacrament may be administered if there is reason to believe, by trial as recommended, that he will have no attack for about half an hour after receiving. This is the rule laid down by the "Modo

[1] St. Lig., n. 292, et Busemb., ibid. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 15. Bouvier, *Notanda circa Viaticum*, 4°.

[2] St. Lig, n. 292.

[3] St. Lig., n. 288, *Dicunt Suarez*, etc., Modo Pratico, cap. vii. Benedict XIV., *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. xiii. cap. xix. n. 25. Caval., cap. v. Decr. vi. n. vi. De Herdt, l. c.

"Pratico",[1] probably because within this time, in any state of the stomach, the species would be altered so that there could be no danger of irreverence.[2] If the vomit, however, is not provoked by food, but is frequent independently of any food, he should be free from it for at least six hours before the sacrament is administered.[3]

If, after all, a doubt still remains as to whether the Sacred Host can be received without the irreverence against which the present rubric is designed to guard, the more common and the more probable opinion is, that it ought not to be administered.[4] In such circumstances, the sick person should be exhorted to make a spiritual communion.[5]

783. Should the Sacred Host be rejected by vomit, if it still appears entire, or is easily discernible, it should be reverently taken up and carried in a clean vessel to the church, to be kept there until it corrupts, when it is to be thrown into the sacrarium. If it cannot be distinguished from the rest of what is thrown off, all should be carefully taken up and burned, and the ashes thrown into the sacrarium. This is what is recommended by Bouvier,[6] and it is in accordance with what is prescribed by the rubric of the missal.[7]

We have already touched on the difficulties that regard the administration of the viaticum to children.[8]

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Vid. Supra, n. 594.
[3] Busemb., apud St. Lig., n. 292. Gury, ii. n. 320. Modo Pratico, l. c.
[4] St. Lig., l. c.
[5] Modo Pratico, cap. vii. in fine.
[6] Loc. cit., 5°.
[7] *De Defectibus*, tit. x. n. 14.
[8] Vid. supra, n. 640.

§ VII.—**Ceteris autem infirmis, qui ob devotionem in ægritudine communicant, danda est Eucharistia ante omnem cibum et potum, non aliter ac ceteris Fidelibus, quibus nec etiam per modum medicinæ ante aliquid summere licet.**

784. Sickness of itself, unless when there is danger of death, does not exempt from the general law which requires those who receive the Holy Eucharist to be fasting from midnight. Hence the sick who communicate through devotion must observe it like the other faithful, by an entire abstinence from food or drink, or anything, even by way of medicine.

785. But it may be asked whether a sick person who, though not in danger of death, is yet unable to fast till a convenient hour in the morning, and who continues in this state for a long time, may be permitted to receive holy communion after having broken his fast.

The question is discussed at great length in the "Melan-"ges Theologiques".[1] Amongst the authors there cited, some, as Elbel and Witasse, expressly affirm that he may be permitted occasionally: others, as Toletus and Tournely, plainly imply that he may be permitted when there is any urgent cause. The writer himself strongly insists that he may be permitted, at least in order to fulfil the Paschal precept, which is the sole question he proposes to himself to answer; and he labours hard to refute a Latin dissertation maintaining the opposite view, which he gives at full length.[2] He relies very much on the argument that the Paschal precept, or the precept of annual communion,

[1] I^re^ Serie, pp. 400 et seq.

[2] Ibid., pag. 422 et seq.

which is probably the determination of the divine precept,[1] ought to prevail over the law which requires the Eucharist to be received fasting, just as the precept of receiving it in danger of death prevails over the same law. He contends that as the faithful, in order to fulfil the latter precept, are exempt from the obligation of fasting when it is attended with inconvenience, so should they be, and so it is to be presumed they are, in like manner exempt, when they are required to fulfil the former. When it is objected that a parity of reasoning would prove the exemption not only for the fulfilment of the Paschal precept, but at least for several communions in the year, just as the exemption in favour of those in danger of death is extended to a repetition of the viaticum, he replies by virtually admitting the parity and the inference; he sees no inconvenience in it, but he would not insist on it.[2] This opinion seems not improbable, and we should be slow to condemn one who would make up his mind to act on it.

786. But on the other hand, the interpretation of the law which requires the Eucharist to be received fasting, and the nature and extent of the exemption granted to the sick, can be ascertained only by the practice of the Church made known to us by the testimony of her doctors and theologians.[3] Mere reasoning from analogy will avail us little. A priest, for example, most probably could not celebrate without sacred vestments, or without an altar, in order to receive the viaticum, though the vestments and the altar are required only by the law of the Church, while he is bound to receive the viaticum by

[1] Vid. St. Lig., n. 297.
[2] Pag. 425, n. 12.
[3] Vid De Lugo, Disp. xv. sec. iii. n. 66.

divine precept.[1] Now the great bulk of theologians, though they do not discuss the present question in precise terms, either suppose or expressly assert that the sick, in order to have the privilege of communicating without being fasting, must be in danger of death. It is true, therefore, as Gury says,[2] that the common opinion of theologians is against the permission of communion in the case proposed. The present rubric is also against it, at least when there is question of communion, "**ob devotionem**", and we think it means to embrace all communions of the sick who are not in danger of death, the "**Ceteris infirmis**", being all who are not "**brevi morituri**". A strong argument is also furnished against it by the Papal indults, which have been granted to certain individuals labouring under infirmities of this kind, and in virtue of which they were permitted to receive after having broken the fast. One of these was granted by Benedict XIV. to the son of James II., king of England, and the brief contains the following words, which appear to be decisive: "Cum generali lege "caveatur ut nonnisi jejuno universim sacra ministretur "communio . . . ut alicui expressis casibus (exceptis) non "comprehenso liceat, etsi non jejuno, sacra participare "mysteria, necesse erit eundem expressa dispensatione "juvari, quæ porro dispensatio, a nemine præter Romanum "Pontificem potest indulgeri".[3]

787. The case seemingly can but very rarely occur, for if one be unable to fast from midnight till an early hour in the morning, his infirmity is generally such as to

[1] De Lugo, ibid., n. 61, et Disp. xiv. sec. v. n. 108.
[2] Vol. ii. n. 334. Qu. 11°.
[3] Constit. *Quadam de more*, 24. Mar., 1756, § 4.

justify communion "per modum viatici". The writer in the "Melanges", however, testifies that it occurs often enough, especially amongst those who are affected with asthma. In practice, then, we think the most that can be done without a Papal dispensation, is to administer communion to one in the circumstances soon after midnight. Gury[1] thinks this may be done several times in the year, or at least in order that he may fulfil the Paschal precept. So does the author of the Latin dissertation already referred to.[2] The general prohibition against carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick at night would not extend to a case of this kind, which might be fairly regarded as a case of necessity. At all events there is little difficulty about the matter in countries where the Blessed Sacrament cannot be carried in procession, or when there is question of one sick in a college, convent, or other religious house in which the Blessed Sacrament is kept.[3] Should it happen, however, that the Blessed Sacrament cannot conveniently be brought during the night, one in the circumstances supposed would be exempt from the precept of Paschal communion while the infirmity continues.[4]

§ VIII.—**Sed alicui ad adorandum solum, seu devotionis, seu cujusvis rei prætextu ad ostendendum non deferatur.**

788. The Blessed Sacrament is never to be brought to any one merely that he may satisfy his devotion by

[1] Loc. cit. [2] Supra, n. **785.**

[3] Cfr. Gury, "*Casus Conscientiæ*", De Eucharistia, casus xix. vol. ii. n. 298. [4] **Bouvier,** *De Eucharistia*, cap. v. art. ii. § ii.

adoring it, or remaining in presence of it. It is to be brought to the sick to be administered to them, and for no other purpose. But should the priest, on coming to the house, find that the sick person is unable to receive communion, St. Charles directs him to place the Blessed Sacrament on the table prepared, and kneel down and pray for some time before it with those who are present, so that the sick person may join in this act of devotion. He adds, that if the sick person earnestly desires it, the priest may even uncover the pyxis, and allow him to adore the Blessed Sacrament exposed. And on leaving he is to give the benediction with the pyxis.[1]

§ IX.—**Deferri autem debet hoc Sanctum Sacramentum ab Ecclesia ad privatas ægrotantium domos decenti habitu, superposito mundo velamine, manifeste atque honorifice ante pectus cum omni reverentia et timore, semper lumine præcedente.**

789. Where, as in Ireland, the Blessed Sacrament cannot be carried in the manner here prescribed, the priest should, at least, endeavour to comply with the spirit of the rubrics, by showing towards it all the marks of reverence which circumstances permit, as often as he carries it to the sick. The words of this rubric regarding the manner of carrying the Blessed Sacrament, are taken from a decretal of Honorius III., in the thirteenth century,[2] and are fully explained in the rubrics that follow.

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. i. Conc. Prov. V. *Quæ ad Sanctiss. Euch. Sacramentum pertinent*, pag. 180; pars. iv. *De Visitat. Infirm.*, § *De Communione*, pag. 446.

[2] Apud Catal. tit. iv. cap. iv. § vii. n. i.

§ X.—**Parochus igitur processurus ad communicandum infirmum, aliquot campanæ ictibus jubeat convocari Parochianos, seu Confraternitatem Sanctissimi Sacramenti (ubi fuerit instituta), seu alios pios Christi fideles, qui Sacram Eucharistiam cum cereis seu intorticiis comitentur, et umbellam seu baldachinum, ubi haberi potest, deferant.**

790. In countries where the Blessed Sacrament can be carried to the sick publicly and in solemn procession, the church bell should be rung so as to give notice to those who may desire to accompany it, by the number of strokes, or the manner of tolling the bell.[1] The members of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament are bound by one of their rules to attend and carry lights in these processions, or send one of their family to do so, and hence they are specially mentioned in the rubric. The chief object of this confraternity is to honour our Lord in the sacrament of His love, and to repair the many outrages He has there to suffer. It may be established anywhere by authority of the ordinary of the diocese, and the members become entitled at once to all the privileges and indulgences that have been granted, or may hereafter be granted, to the confraternity at Rome.[2]

791. The "baldachinum" is the large and richly-decorated canopy used in processions of the Blessed Sacrament. It is supported by long staves, which it is the highest honour to be permitted to carry.[3] The "umbella" is a small canopy which opens like an umbrella, but flat, not conical. It is supported on a single staff, and carried by

[1] Baruff., tit. xxvi. n. 82.

[2] Cfr. Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, III^me^ Part, chap. ii. sec. ii. art. i.

[3] Vid. Cæremoniale Episcoporum, lib. ii. cap. xxxiii. n. 21.

one person, and is consequently much more convenient than the "baldachinum" for carrying the Viaticum, as it is often necessary to pass through narrow streets and entrances.[1] Both are used for the processions of Holy Thursday and Corpus Christi.[2]

§ XI.—**Præmoneat, ut ægri cubiculum mundetur, et in eo paretur mensa linteo mundo cooperta, in qua Sanctissimum Sacramentum decenter deponatur. Parentur luminaria, ac duo vascula, alterum cum vino, alterum cum aqua. Præterea linteum mundum ante pectus communicandi ponatur, atque alia ad ornatum loci pro cujusque facultate.**

792. The chamber of the sick person ought to be as clean as possible, and suitably ornamented according to his means and circumstances. In it there should be prepared a table covered with a clean white napkin, on which the priest may place the pyxis. St. Charles prescribes that there be on the table a crucifix, and, at least, two wax candles.[3]

793. If the sick man be a priest, there should be in readiness a surplice and a white stole, to be put on when he is receiving the viaticum.[4] If a cleric, but not a priest, there should be a surplice.[5] It might be inconvenient, in many cases, on account of the condition of the patient, to put on the surplice; but it can rarely happen that there would be any inconvenience in putting on the stole. The ceremony of administering the viaticum to a priest,

[1] Baruff., n. 93.

[2] Vid. Merati, pars. iv. tit. viii. n. x., et tit. xii. n. xiv. Baldeschi, tom. iv. cap. vi. art. iii. n. 23.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Concil. Prov. V. *Quæ ad SS. Euch. Sacr. pertinent*, pag. 180.

[4] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 17. i. 20°.

[5] De Herdt, ibid. Vid. supra, n. 676.

differs in no other respect from what is observed in administering it to laics. The Sacred Congregation forbade the use of any rite not prescribed in the Ritual.[1]

794. Although the rubric here directs that there be two little vessels prepared for the purification of the priest's fingers, one containing wine and the other water, Baruffaldi[2] observes that it is sufficient to have one containing water, as wine is seldom or never used. St. Charles prescribes only a single vessel of glass.[3] There should be also in readiness a clean linen cloth to be placed under the chin and serve as a communion cloth. This is specially necessary in giving communion to the sick, lest a sudden fit of coughing or some other accident might cause the sacred Host to be rejected.[4]

795. To have these preparations made, it is necessary that the priest give notice beforehand "**præmoneat**", as the rubric directs him. It is not enough, however, that he give notice immediately before he goes to the house. In his instructions regarding the sacrament of the Eucharist, he should take occasion to speak of the communion of the sick, and explain in detail the preparations required, having due regard, of course, to the circumstances of his people. He might get established in his parish, a Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, or induce the members of some other pious confraternity, as *e.g.*, that of our Lady of Mount Carmel, to coöperate with him in carrying out, as far as circumstances permit, what is prescribed by the ritual.

[1] 21 Jul., 1855, *in Briocen*, ad 101, n. 522.
[2] Tit. xxvi. n. 102 et n. 184. [3] *Acta Eccl. Med.*, l. c.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 783.

In Catholic countries on the Continent, the members of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament undertake this charitable office, and even supply themselves whatever is necessary in the houses of the poor.[1] We have no doubt that in Ireland many would be found in almost every parish, who, if asked, would willingly do the same.

796. Of course, cases will often occur, in which the preparations here mentioned must be dispensed with, either from want of time, or from the impossibility of procuring what is required in the place where the sick person is lying. To meet such cases, it would be desirable to have a small box containing all the requisites, which the priest could bring with him or send before him. This is strongly recommended by the first Synod of Westminster[2] to priests on the English mission. We have seen a box of this kind, not larger than a good-sized duodecimo volume, constructed so as to contain a corporal, a communion cloth, a vessel for ablution, a purificator, two wax candles, a crucifix, and a vessel of holy water.

§ XII.—**Ubi vero convenerint qui Eucharistiam comitaturi sunt, Sacerdos indutus superpelliceo et stola, et, si haberi potest, pluviali albi coloris, Acolythis seu Clericis, aut etiam Presbyteris si locus feret, superpelliceo pariter indutis comitatus, decenter, et de more acceptas aliquot Particulas consecratas, vel unam tantum (si longius aut difficilius iter sit faciendum) ponat in pyxide, seu parva custodia, quam proprio suo operculo coperit, et velum sericum superimponit: ipse vero Sacerdos, imposito sibi prius ab utroque humero oblongo velo decenti, utraque manu accipiat vas cum Sacramento, et deinde umbellam seu baldachinum subeat, nudo capite processurus.**

[1] Baruff., n. 103. Vid. *Acta Eccl. Med.*, ll. cc.

[2] Decr. xviii. 12°.

797. These instructions as to the manner of carrying the Blessed Sacrament, have reference for the most part, as is evident, to those solemn processions which cannot take place with us. We shall content ourselves, therefore, with noticing those points that may serve in some way to guide the priest in the circumstances in which he is placed in these countries. In the first place, he is supposed, in carrying the Blessed Sacrament, to be vested in surplice and stole, and even, if convenient, a cope; and he retains these vestments, at least the surplice and stole, in administering the viaticum. With us the priest goes to the house of the sick person in his ordinary dress; but he should bring with him, or contrive to send before him, the vestments which the rubric requires him to wear.

798. St. Liguori says "Ministrare (Eucharistiam), sine "stola et superpelliceo communiter censent Doctores esse "mortale ex genere suo":[1] and the Sacred Congregation being asked whether the custom prevailing in some places of administering communion to the sick with a stole alone "super vestem communem", and without the surplice, might be allowed, answered: "Negative, et eli- "minata consuetudine servetur Ritualis Romani præscrip- "tum".[2] Some theologians go so far as to say that the priest should rather permit one to die without the viaticum, than adminster it without the sacred vestments prescribed by the rubric. But it is more commonly admitted, that in case of necessity, the viaticum may be administered without any sacred vestments.[3]

[1] Lib. vi. n. 241.

[2] 16 Dec., 1826, *in una Gandaven.*, ad. 1. Quæsiti, ii. n. 4623. Vid. Gardellini, *Annotat.* in hoc. decret.

[3] Vid. St. Lig., l. c. Caval., tom. iv. cap. v. *De Com. Infirm.*, in Decr. vii. n. v.

799. The colour of the stole should be white, as is plain from the rubric, and this, no matter on what day the Blessed Sacrament is brought to the sick, even though it be Good Friday.[1] In the Ambrosian rite the colour used is red.[2]

800. The Blessed Sacrament is supposed to be kept in the church, where consequently the priest and his attendants meet and vest as here prescribed. The priest then takes some particles out of the pyxis or ciborium in the tabernacle, and puts them into the small pyxis or "custodia", which is to be carefully closed and covered with a silk veil. Besides the large pyxis or ciborium which is kept in the tabernacle, there ought to be in every parochial church a smaller pyxis for carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick.[3] The "custodia" here mentioned differs in form from the pyxis, and is used as more convenient and more secure when the journey is long, or must be made on horseback.[4] Baruffaldi[5] and Cavalieri[6] seem to suppose that the silk veil which the rubric directs to be placed over it, is no other than the humeral veil which the priest puts on before he takes the Blessed Sacrament in his hands when the procession is starting. The rubric, however, appears to distinguish them, and to require here for the "pyxis" or "custodia", a small veil, such as is prescribed in a preceding chapter.[7]

[1] Sac. Rit. Cong., 15 Maii, 1745, *in Lucana*, n. 4170.

[2] *Act. Mediol. Eccl.*, pars. iv. § *Ordo Minist. Euch. Sacram. Infirmis*, p. 447.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. i. § *Quæ ad SS. Euch. Sacram. pertinent*, pag. 110.

[4] Catal., cap. iv. § x. n. iv. Baruff., n. 121. Vid. infra, §. xiv.

[5] Loc. cit. [6] *De Com. Inf.*, Decr. vii. n. viii. [7] Vid. supra, n. 801.

The priest having taken the pyxis in his hands, covers it with the extremities of the humeral veil, and carries it before his breast, the left hand holding the "nodus", and the right resting on the lid, at the same time keeping over it the ends of the veil.[1]

801. In these countries the priest is, generally speaking, permitted to keep the Blessed Sacrament in his house.[2] He would do well to have the small pyxis which he carries to the sick, always in readiness, so that it may be unnecessary for him to transfer any particles to it when he is required to attend a call. As he goes in his ordinary dress and without attendants, we would not require him to vest in order to take the pyxis out of the tabernacle. It is enough, that, having opened the door, he genuflect and adore the Blessed Sacrament. He may then take out the pyxis and fasten it as directed below.[3] Should it be necessary, however, to transfer particles from a larger pyxis or ciborium, whether in his private oratory or in the church, we think he ought to vest in surplice and stole, for nothing short of strict necessity could justify him in thus handling the Blessed Sacrament without the vestments prescribed by the rubric.

§ XIII.—**Præcedat semper Acolythus, vel alius Minister deferens laternam (noctu autem hoc Sacramentum deferri non debet, nisi necessitas urgeat); sequantur duo Clerici, vel qui illorum vices suppleant, quorum alter aquam benedictam cum aspersorio, et bursam cum corporali quod supponendum erit vasculo Sanctissimi Sacramenti super mensa in cubiculo infirmi, et cum linteolo purifica-**

[1] Vid. Gavant., par. iv. tit. viii. *De Feria V. in Cœna Dom.*, rub. 9. lit. a. [2] Vid. supra, n. 800. [3] Infra, § xiv.

torio ad digitos Sacerdotis abstergendos; alter hunc librum Ritualem deferat, et campanulam jugiter pulset; succedant deinde deferentes intorticia; postremo Sacerdos Sacramentum gestans elevatum ante pectus sub umbella, dicens Psalmum *Miserere* et alios Psalmos, et Cantica.

802. This rubric contains the instructions regarding the solemn procession. They are very clear and very minute. It may be seen that great pains are taken to have the Blessed Sacrament always accompanied with lights, no matter what be the state of the weather. Hence it is prescribed that a lantern be always carried, as the light it contains is protected from the wind, and will serve to re-light the others that may happen to be blown out.[1] And although, according to a decree of Benedict XIII.,[2] there should be four lanterns, two on each side of the priest, when he carries the Blessed Sacrament outside the church, the lantern here prescribed should still be carried at the head of the procession, for the convenience of lighting the torches if required.[3]

803. The Blessed Sacrament should not be brought to the sick at night, unless in case of necessity. The reason assigned is, because it cannot then be carried with so much solemnity and reverence.[4] This reason does not apply where, as in these countries, it is never carried to the sick in public procession. At all events the case of necessity, that is, when there is danger that

[1] Baruff., n. 131.

[2] Conc. Rom., 1725, tit. xv. cap. vii. Labbe, tom. xxi pag. 1876.

[3] Catal., cap. iv. § xi. n. ii.

[4] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, Conc. V. § *Quæ ad SS. Euchar. Sacram. pertinent*, pag. 180. Catal., l. c. Baruff., n. 133.

the person might otherwise be unable to receive the viaticum, is excepted. We have already mentioned another case which, though not strictly one of necessity, may be regarded as an exception.[1]

804. It remains to say a word about the way of providing, in these countries, the requisites which are here supposed to be carried by clerks in the procession. The holy water should be already in the chamber of the sick person, and may be placed on or beside the table before mentioned.[2] Even when the Blessed Sacrament is brought in procession, if the priest knows that there is holy water in the house he is going to, he need not bring any with him.[3]

A feather, a little brush, or something similar, may be easily found in the house, and will serve as an "asperso-rium", which, as Baruffaldi observes, may be of any material.[4]

The corporal to be spread out under the pyxis when it is placed on the table, must be brought by the priest. If not carried in a box with the other requisites,[5] it is usually folded up, and with it a small purificator, in the case which contains the pyxis.

The burse in which the corporal is carried when a procession is formed, is of course dispensed with; so also is the bell, the use of which is to give notice to the people along the way, that they may adore the Blessed Sacrament as it passes.

805. The priest is directed to say the psalm "*Mise-*

[1] Vid. supra, n. **787.**
[2] Baruff., n. 136.
[3] Vid. supra, n. **796.**
[4] Supra, n. **792.**
[4] Loc. cit. n. 137.

"*rere*", and other psalms and canticles. In processions, the penitential psalms, with appropriate hymns and canticles, are recited alternately by the ecclesiastics. This was ordered by several provincial councils, amongst the rest the fifth Council of Milan under St. Charles.[1] The "*Miserere*" is the only psalm distinctly prescribed, but the other penitential psalms are recommended when there is time, and with them the canticles "*Benedicite*", "*Magnificat*", etc.[2] If there be none to chant these, or recite them alternately with the priest, he says them himself "submissa voce", and the rest may say the rosary, the litanies, or other prayers, the object of all being to implore the divine mercy for the sick. In reciting the litanies, the response should be "*Ora pro eo*", or "*Ora pro eâ*".[3] The priest reciting alone, may say with the "*Miserere*", any other psalms or canticles, as, *e.g.*, the "*Benedictus*", or the "*Magnificat*", which he may know by heart.[4]

§ XIV.—**Quod si longius aut difficilius iter obeundum sit, et fortasse etiam equitandum, necesse erit vas, in quo Sacramentum defertur, bursa decenter ornata, et ad collum appensa, apte includere, et ita ad pectus alligare atque obstringere, ut neque decidere, neque pyxide excuti Sacramentum queat.**

806. In country parishes in Ireland, the priest must go a considerable distance, and is very often obliged to

[1] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. i. Conc. Prov. § *Quæ ad SS. Euch. pertinent*, pag. 180.

[2] Baruff., n. 151 et seq. Caval., *De Com. Inf.*, Decr. xi. n. iv.

[3] Caval., l. c. n. v. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 17. i. 4^to.

[4] Catal., l. c. § xii. n. vi. De Herdt, l. c.

ride to the houses of the sick. He must carefully attend, therefore, to what is here prescribed by the rubric for the greater security of the Blessed Sacrament in such circumstances. The "bursa", here mentioned is different from that referred to in the preceding rubric, which is for holding the corporal. This is generally a kind of loose bag of a suitable size and shape, for holding the pyxis.[1]

It should be securely closed and fastened round the neck by a cord or chain, so as to prevent the danger of the pyxis falling, or of any of the particles being shaken out. The pyxis, or custodia, is sometimes provided with a handle or hook, to which the chain may be attached, and in this way it is more secure than when merely the "bursa" containing it is fastened to the neck. A leathern case, lined with silk, may be used as the "bursa", and many prefer it to the loose bag, as being a better protection to the pyxis.

807. Whatever it be made of, it should not be permitted to hang loosely from the neck, but be made fast on the breast, as the rubric here directs, so as to prevent the danger of the pyxis falling, or of the Blessed Sacrament being shaken out. This may be done, as the words of the rubric would seem to suggest, by strings attached to the case or "bursa", and after passing round the back, fastened in front, or it may be done by putting the pyxis with its covering into a pocket made in the vest for this purpose, and used for no other. De Herdt cites a decree of a Belgian Synod, which forbids the Blessed Sacrament to be carried in the pocket.[2] But the decree applies,

[1] Baruff., n. 157. [2] Pars. vi. n. 16. ii. 1°.

perhaps, to its being carried in an ordinary pocket. At all events, unless where there is a special prohibition, we think it may be carried, as it usually is in Ireland, and with great security, in a pocket made for the purpose inside the vest.

§ XV.—**Ingrediens vero locum ubi jacet infirmus, dicat:** ℣. *Pax huic domui, etc.*

808. The salutation here prescribed in the ritual, is that which our Lord Himself prescribed in His instructions to the seventy-two disciples: "Into whatsoever house you "enter, first say 'Peace be to this house'".[1] The priest is, in nearly every case, directed to use these words on his first entrance into any house or place where he is about to perform a duty of his sacred ministry. But should he perform several distinct duties before leaving—should he, *e.g.*, administer the Viaticum and Extreme Unction, and give the benediction "in articulo mortis", as very often happens—he is not required to repeat the words at the commencement of each. The ritual gives them, it is true, but the ritual clearly supposes that the functions take place separately, and that the priest comes to the house for each.[2]

§ XVI.—**Tum depositum Sacramentum super mensa, supposito corporali, genuflexus adorat, omnibus in genua procumbentibus; et mox accepta aqua benedicta, aspergit infirmum, et cubiculum, dicens Antiphonam:** *Asperges me, etc.*, **et primum versum Psalmi,** *Miserere mei, Deus,* **cum**

[1] Luke, x. 5.

[2] Vid. Revue Theologique, 1856, 1re Serie, pag. 615.

Gloria Patri, etc. **Deinde repetitur Antiphona:** *Asperges me, etc.*

Postea: ℣. *Adjutorium nostrum, etc.*

809. Having entered the chamber with the preceding salutation, he places the Blessed Sacrament on the table, on which he has been careful first to spread out the corporal, for the pyxis should be laid down nowhere, if possible, without a corporal under it.[1] Then the priest, and all who are present, adore the Blessed Sacrament, genuflecting on both knees, according to Baruffaldi[2] and Catalani,[3] but Cavalieri[4] thinks the priest should genuflect only on one knee.

810. He sprinkles the holy water on the sick person in the form of a cross.[5] The rubric prescribes this in similar circumstances elsewhere, from which it is inferred that here also the sprinkling should be in the form of a cross.[6] Standing as nearly as possible opposite to the sick person, but so as not to turn his back to the Blessed Sacrament, he sprinkles the water first in the centre, *i.e.*, in front of himself, then on his (own) left, then on his (own) right, thus forming the cross with the water over the sick person.[7] He then sprinkles some around him, on the floors or walls of the chamber, and on those who are present, taking care that none may fall on the pyxis,[8] and saying,

[1] Sac. Rit. Cong., 27 Feb., 1847, *in Cong. Cler. Reg. S. Crucis*, n. 5068. Vid. supra, n. 664.

[2] Tit. xxvi. n. 160. [3] Tit. iv. cap. iv. § xiii. n. ii.

[4] *De Com. Infirmorum*, Decr. xi. n. vii.

[5] De Herdt, para. vi. n. 17. i. 8°.

[6] Vid. Cavalieri, *De Agone Infirm.*, Decr. ii. n. xi.

[7] Vid. infra, chap. xvi. § v. in fine. [8] De Herdt, l. c.

while he sprinkles, the antiphon, "*Asperges me*", etc., as directed by the rubric.

In the ordinary aspersion before mass, the antiphon during Paschal time, is "*Vidi aquam egredientem*", etc.[1] But the Sacred Congregation decided that, in administering the viaticum, no change should be made, so that the antiphon "*Asperges*", etc., and the first verse of the psalm "*Miserere*", are to be used at all times.[2]

811. While saying "*Adjutorium nostrum*", etc., he makes on himself the sign of the cross. This is not prescribed by any rubric of the ritual, as it is by the rubric of the missal at the commencement of mass.[3] Nor is it mentioned by any of the commentators we have seen. But in treating of the general rubrics, given hereafter in the ritual, to be observed in benedictions, many authors distinctly say that the priest signs himself in pronouncing these words.[4] Thus, then, although it does not appear that he is bound, he is certainly recommended, to do so here, since the present ceremony, as far as the prayer "*Exaudi nos*", etc., inclusive, is like that which is assigned for the "Benedictio Domorum" in another part of the ritual. At all events, there is a general custom in favour of his making the sign of the cross on himself at these words.[5] The proper way of making it is to put the hand to the forehead at "*Adjutorium*"; to the breast,

[1] Rub. Missalis, "*De Benedictione Aquæ*".

[2] 11 Feb., 1702, *in Lerien*, ad 7. n. 3614.

[3] *Ritus Servandus*, etc., § iii. n. 7.

[4] St. Carol., *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. *Instruct. gener. pro Benedictionibus*, pag. 462. Catal., vol. ii. tit. viii. cap. i. § iv. De Herdt, pars. v. n. 37. vii. 5°.

[5] Cfr. Revue Theologique, loc. cit. pag. 616.

at "*nostrum*"; to the left shoulder, at "*in nomine*"; and to the right at "*Domini*".[1]

§ XVII.—**His dictis, accedat ad infirmum, ut cognoscat num sit bene dispositus ad accipiendum sacrum Viaticum et utrum velit aliqua peccata confiteri; et illum audiat, atque absolvat: quamvis prius deberet esse rite confessus, nisi necessitas aliter urgeat.**

812. As a general rule, the Blessed Sacrament is not to be brought to the sick person until he has been previously visited by the priest, and has made his confession, because he might not be in a condition to receive communion, or even to be absolved, on the first visit of the priest.[2] If the case be urgent, however, and the distance considerable, the priest may bring it with him on his first visit. In Ireland and other countries where it cannot be carried in procession, he usually does so whenever he gets a sick call. In such circumstances, before he takes the pyxis out of its covering, or lets it be known that he has it with him, he takes care to hear the person's confession, and thus be able to decide whether he should administer the viaticum.

But even though he may have made a previous visit, and heard the confession, he should not administer the viaticum until he has given an opportunity of confessing again if the person desires it. His conscience may be still burdened with some sin, which he previously concealed or forgot, and which he now wishes to confess. Besides, by approaching for this purpose, the priest has also an

[1] Merati, pars. ii. tit. iii. n. xvi.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 768.

opportunity of ascertaining whether the sick person be in a physical condition to receive, for even a few hours may have produced a notable change in this respect.[1]

813. If, in these circumstances, he has a long confession to make, and if there be reason to fear that by a tedious confession just then, he may incur grave suspicions injurious to his character, or that, after making it, he may not have time, or may be unable, to receive the viaticum, the priest should be satisfied with hearing a few sins. He can then absolve, reminding him of the obligation of completing the confession, should he be afterwards able.[2] The words of the rubric "**nisi necessitas aliter urgeat**", imply, according to Baruffaldi[3] and Cavalieri,[4] that in such circumstances the priest need not hear the entire confession.

The penance to be imposed should be very light, a short prayer, a single ejaculation, an act of resignation made mentally would suffice, with a general exhortation to submit patiently to his present sufferings, and to do penance if he recovers.[5]

§ XVIII.—**Postea facta de more Confessione generali, sive ab infirmo, sive ejus nomine ab alio, Sacerdos dicit:** *Misereatur, etc., Indulgentiam, etc.*

814. The priest then goes to the table, where the Blessed Sacrament is placed (or where he now places it),[6]

[1] Vid. Baruff., n. 162 et seq. Caval., *De. Com. Inf.*, Decr. xi. n. ix. et x.

[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 260. in parenth. Caval. l. c.

[3] Loc. cit. n. 167.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] St. Lig., n. 507. ii.

[6] Supra, n. 812.

and having genuflected, uncovers the pyxis. Meantime the communion cloth should be adjusted under the chin, and the stole, if the person be a priest, around the neck.[1] The "*Confiteor*" is said as is prescribed for the ordinary communion in the church. It is to be said by the sick person, if he be able; if not, it is to be said in his name by the clerk or minister in attendance, or by any one present, or if there be no one else, by the priest himself.[2]

815. After the "*Confiteor*", the priest again genuflects, and turns towards the sick person, taking care, however, not to turn his back to the Blessed Sacrament. In this position, he says "*Misereatur*", *etc.*, "*Indulgentiam*", *etc.*, using the words "*tui*", "*tuis*", in the singular, but observing the very same ceremonies as before directed for communion in the church.[3] The text of the Roman ritual has simply "*Misereatur*", *etc.*, "*Indulgentiam*", *etc.*, and does not, therefore, expressly prescribe the use of "*tui*", "*tuis*", in the singular; on the contrary, it seems rather to imply that the form should be "*vestri*", "*vestris*", in the plural, as this is the form given in full before for communion in the church, and to be used, according to all, even when there is but one communicant.[4]

To this, however, it may be replied that the "*Confi-* "*teor*" is there expressly directed to be said "**nomine pe-** "**puli**", whereas here it is to be said "**ab infirmo sive ejus** "**nomine ab alio**", and that, therefore, the "*Misereatur*", etc., should be directed in the former case to the people, and in the latter to the sick person alone. But at all events,

[1] Baruff., n. 206.
[2] Vid. De Herdt, n. 22, 5°.
[3] Chap. xii. § iii.
[4] Supra, n. 668.

the commentators are unanimous in teaching that the form here should be in the singular.[1] The most probable reason for it is, according to Cavalieri,[2] that the Church wishes our prayers on this occasion to be offered specially on behalf of the sick person, just as in reciting the litanies for the dying, we are directed by the ritual to say in the singular "*Ora pro eo (eâ)*", and to suggest to the dying person the prayer "*Sancta Maria, ora pro me*", etc., although in other circumstances, one reciting these, even when alone, would say "*Ora pro nobis*".

§ XIX.—**Deinde facta genuflexione, accipit Sacramentum de vasculo, atque illud elevans ostendit infirmo, dicens:** *Ecce Agnus Dei, etc.*, **et more solito ter dicat:** *Domine non sum dignus, etc.*

Et infirmus simul cum Sacerdote dicat eadem verba, saltem semel, submissa voce.

816. He then turns to the Blessed Sacrament, and again genuflects; and holding the pyxis in his left hand, he takes the host, and holds it with the thumb and index of his right, proceeding exactly as directed before,[3] except that here he turns towards the sick person,[4] while saying "*Ecce Agnus*", etc. He is required to let him see the host, and it is plain, therefore, that he should turn towards him, no matter what be the position of the table, which, however, should if possible be placed so that the

[1] Baruff., n. 170. Caval., cap. v. in Decr. xi. n. xi. De Herdt, par. vi. n. 17. 10°.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Supra, chap. xii. § iv.

[4] Caval., l. c. n. xii.

crucifix on the centre of it could be easily seen by the sick person.

817. It is here directed, that the "*Domine non sum "dignus*", etc., be said by the sick person at the same time with the priest, at least that it be said once by him, but in a low tone. He should be previously instructed to do this. The priest could remind him of it in the little exhortation which he ought to address to him immediately before uncovering the pyxis. If he cannot say it in Latin, he may say it in the vernacular, but the priest is not at liberty to repeat it in the vernacular, just before presenting the host, by way of suggesting it to him at that moment.[1]

§ XX.—**Tum Sacerdos dans infirmo Eucharistiam, dicat:** *Accipe frater* (vel *soror*), *Viaticum, etc.*

818. This is the form to be used whenever the Blessed Sacrament is administered "per modum viatici". And we have seen under a preceding rubric,[2] that it is to be so administered, whenever it is probable that the person will be unable to receive again.

According to Clericatus,[3] Baruffaldi,[4] and others, this formula being prescribed by the Church, has a certain efficacy attached to it, and, therefore, should always be used when the Eucharist is given as the Viaticum. According to St. Liguori, however, the rubric does not bind *sub gravi*, and the substitution of the words "*Corpus*

[1] Vid supra, n. 672.
[2] Supra, § iv.
[3] *De Eucharistia*, Decis. xix. n. 12.
[4] Tit. xxvi. n. 173.

"*Domini*", etc., would not exceed a venial sin. And hence, if the sick person would be greatly distressed by hearing the words "*Accipe*", etc., the priest would be justified in omitting them, and using the ordinary form "*Corpus*", etc.[1] The case must be a very rare one, in which it would be found necessary or expedient to act on this decision, for, as has been before stated,[2] the priest is, at least generally speaking, bound to give him notice of his danger, and cannot, therefore, be justified in departing from the rubric to conceal that danger, or avoid any allusion to it in administering the sacrament. We may however, conceive a case in which the person is in the state of grace, and, therefore, not unprepared for death, however suddenly it may come, while at the same time his danger would be notably aggravated by any warning of it. In such a case, the decision might be acted on, but hardly, we think, in any other.

§ XXI.—**Si vero communio non datur per modum Viatici, dicat more ordinario:** *Corpus Domini, etc.*

819. If the communion be not administered "per "modum viatici", the ordinary form "*Corpus Domini*", etc., is used. This, taken in connection with the preceding rubric, shows plainly that to administer the Eucharist "pro viatico", "per modum viatici", etc., is understood to imply the use of the form "*Accipe frater*", etc. The expressions are used constantly in this sense.[3]

820. The change here marked is the only one men-

[1] Lib. vi. n. 285. Dub. 4.
[2] Vid. supra, § iv. et § v.
[3] Supra, n. 771.

tioned in the ritual for the case in which the sick communicate in the ordinary way. According to Cavalieri,[1] "*Misereatur vestri*", etc., is to be said, and not, as in giving the viaticum, "*Misereatur tui*", etc. But the other prayers and ceremonies prescribed in this chapter are to remain unaltered.[2]

§ XXII.—**Quod si mors immineat, et periculum sit in mora, tunc dicto *Misereatur, etc.*, prædictis precibus omnibus vel ex parte omissis, ei statim viaticum præbeatur.**

321. If there be reason to fear that the sick person would be unable to receive the sacrament unless it be administered immediately, and without waiting to say the preceding prayers, short as they are, the rubric here directs that the prayers be omitted in whole or in part, as may be judged necessary, and the viaticum be given at once. The words appear to imply, that in no case should the "*Misereatur*", etc., be omitted; but there is no doubt that in urgent necessity whatever precedes the administration of the Host may be omitted;[3] nor are the prayers thus omitted to be afterwards supplied.[4]

322. It might seem that such a case can hardly occur in practice, for if the priest believes that death is so very imminent, he should also believe that the person would be unable to receive the communion, or at least to con-

[1] Cap. v. Decr. xi. n. xi.

[2] Vid. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 17. ii.

[3] Caval., *De Communione Infirmorum*, Decr. xi. n. xv. De Herdt, n. 17. iii°.

[4] De Herdt, ibid.

sume the Sacred Host. Baruffaldi[1] and Cavalieri[2] notice this difficulty, but say that, notwithstanding the risk, the practice of the Church and the sacred canons sanction the administration in the circumstances. The canon, *Is qui*, 8, c. 26. q. 6,[3] which regards the administration of the sacraments to the dying, says: "... et si continuo creditur "moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem et in- "fundatur ori ejus Eucharistia". In accordance with the ancient discipline, these words suppose that the Eucharist might be administered under the species of wine, but they show the intention of the Church, and it may be inferred from them that every effort should be made to administer the viaticum in the only way permitted by the present discipline, that is, under the species of bread.[4] We have seen that, if necessary, a very small particle may be put into a little wine or water, and administered in that way.[5]

823. Of course the administration is not to be attempted, if it be evident that the person is unable to swallow, and that the Blessed Sacrament, therefore, would not pass into the stomach.[6] But the apprehension that death will occur before it is consumed or altered in the stomach, is not a sufficient reason why it should be withheld.

If it be observed that, in point of fact, the Sacred Host has not been swallowed, but remains in the mouth after death, it should be taken out reverently and brought to the sacrarium, in some vessel distinct from the pyxis, or in the corporal.[7] But if it be not visible in the mouth,

[1] Tit. xxvi. n. 177. et seq.
[2] Loc. cit.
[3] Cit. apud Caval., l. c.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 677 et seq.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 782.
[6] Vid. De Lugo, Disp. xii. sect. ii. n. 28–29.
[7] De Herdt, n. 17. 18°. Vid. supra, n. 783.

and there be a doubt whether it has been swallowed, nothing further is to be done.[1] There is no irreverence in allowing it, in such circumstances, to be buried with the dead body. There is reason to believe that, in the early ages, it was not unusual in some places to put a consecrated host on the breast of the dead body, and bury it with it.[2]

824. It may be asked whether, in time of pestilence, it would be lawful to administer the viaticum by means of an instrument, or to place it so that the sick person could receive it without its being necessary for the priest to administer it with his hand in the usual way. St. Charles expressly forbade this.[3] St. Liguori, however, thinks it not improbable that it is lawful.[4] The "Modo "Pratico" also would allow it.[5] Benedict XIV. discusses the question at great length, citing authorities on both sides.[6] He is of opinion that some such mode of administering the viaticum in time of pestilence may be sanctioned by the bishop.[7] A priest in Ireland could hardly act on this opinion without giving scandal. At all events we never heard of one who had recourse to any such expedient in order to guard himself against infection.

§ XXIII.—**Postea Sacerdos ablatis digitis nihil dicens, et infirmo detur ablutio.**

825. Having administered the viaticum, he returns

[1] De Herdt, ibid.

[2] Vid. Caval., *De Com. Fidelium*, in Decr. i. n. viii. in fine.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol*, para. i. Conc. Prov. v. § *Cautio in Sacerdote ministrante*, pag. 195.

[4] Lib. vi. n. 244, in parenth.

[5] Cap. vii.

[6] *De Syn. Dioc.*, Lib. xiii. cap. xix. n. 20 et seq.

[7] Loc. cit. n. 27 in fine.

to the table, places the pyxis on the corporal, and (if he has brought more than one particle), genuflects.[1] He then rubs his thumb and index against each other, to make any little fragments that might adhere to them fall into the pyxis, washes them in the vessel prepared for the purpose, and dries them with the purificator, and then covers the pyxis.[2] The words "**nihil dicens**", admonish him that there are no prayers prescribed during the ablution of the fingers here, as there are at mass, when he is required to say "*Corpus tuum*", etc.[3]

826. The ablution is to be given to the sick person if he can conveniently take it, and on this account the quantity of water in the vessel should be very small. The priest himself is not required to administer it. It may be given by one of the attendants.[4] If the sick person, however, would suffer the slightest inconvenience from taking it, it should not be given to him, but either be brought to the church, and thrown into the sacrarium, or thrown into the fire in the house of the sick person.[5] Baruffaldi[6] suggests that, in these circumstances, the priest need not dip his fingers into the vessel, but may dip a part of the purificator into it, and with the part thus moistened, wipe his fingers, and dry them with the remainder. Falise seems to approve of this suggestion.[7] It would be convenient to act on it, if there be no fire into which the ablution could be thrown. We would add,

[1] Caval., *De Com. Infirm.*, Decr. xi. n. xvi. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 17, i. 14°.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 697. [3] Baruff., n. 181. Caval., l. c.

[4] Caval., ibid. De Herdt, l. c. 15°.

[5] Caval., ibid. Baruff., n. 186. De Herdt, ibid. [6] Loc. cit.

[7] III^me^ Partie, sect. i. chap. iii. § iii. n. 8.

that if the purificator has been used before, it should not be dipped into the vessel, but a part should be moistened by carefully pouring a little water on it.

§ XXIV.—**Deinde dicat: ℣. *Dominus vobiscum, etc.***

827. According to some, "*Dominus vobiscum*" should here be omitted, unless when only a single particle has been brought in the pyxis.[1] Cavalieri lays it down as a general rule, that it should be omitted whenever benediction of the Blessed Sacrament immediately follows, as it does here, and again after returning to the church.[2] Gardellini[3] and De Herdt[4] also adopt the same view. But the Sacred Congregation being consulted on the question, replied that the ritual is to be strictly followed.[5]

The clerk or attendant should give the response, and also say "*Amen*" at the close of the prayer.

§ XXV.—**His expletis, si altera Particula Sacramenti superfuerit (superesse autem semper debet, præterquam in casu jam dicto), genuflectit, surgit, et accipiens vas cum Sacramento, facit cum eo signum Crucis super infirmum, nihil dicens, et reverenter illud deferens, ordine quo venerat, revertitur ad Ecclesiam dicendo Psalmum *Laudate Dominum de cœlis*, et alios Psalmos et Hymnos, prout tempus feret.**

828. In countries where it is possible to carry the

[1] Caval., l. c. n. xvii. De Herdt, l. c. 18°.

[2] Vol. iv. cap. ix. in Decr. iii. n. iv.

[3] *Comment ad Instr. Clement*, § xxxi. n. 6 et 7.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] 24 Sept., 1842, *in una* 3ti *Ord. Sti. Franc.*, ad 3. n. 4947. Vid. supra, n. 695.

Blessed Sacrament in procession, as prescribed in the preceding rubrics, there should be at least two consecrated particles in the pyxis, so that at least one may remain after the communion of the sick, to be carried in procession back to the church, as it was carried from it. The case of exception has been mentioned before,[1] and is again noticed with the directions to be followed when it occurs.[2]

According to the general rule, the priest having said the prayer "*Domine sancte*", etc., puts on the humeral veil, genuflects, and having taken the pyxis, and covered it with the extremities of the veil, in the manner before directed,[3] turns to the sick person, and makes over him the sign of the cross in this manner: He first raises the pyxis to the height of his eyes, then lowers it under his breast, raises it again, in the same vertical line, to the height of his shoulders, and then crosses this line by moving it horizontally, first towards his left shoulder, and then towards his right. This is the way of forming the cross in giving benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, whether in the remonstrance,[4] or in the pyxis.[5] But here, after moving the pyxis to his right, he does not complete the circle as he does in giving benediction at the altar,[6] but brings it back before his breast to the position in which he should hold it in the procession.

[1] Supra, § xii. [2] Infra, § xxix.

[3] Baruff., n. 188. Caval., cap. v. Decr. xi. n. xviii.

[4] Baldeschi, *Esposizione*, etc., tom. iv. Appendice i. art. vii. n. 58. Syn. Thurl., Append. ii.

[5] Baldeschi, Append. ii. n. 5.

[6] Baldeschi. Synod Thurl., ll. cc.

While giving the benediction he says nothing, according to the present rubric, and this is to be always observed in the act of giving benediction with the Blessed Sacrament.[1]

829. The procession is now formed as before, and he carries it back to the church in the same manner as he carried it from it.[2] The prayers and canticles prescribed on leaving the church, are directed to implore the divine mercy in favour of the sick, to whom the Blessed Sacrament is carried.[3] Those here prescribed on returning are different, being recited in praise and thanksgiving for the immense favour conferred.[4] The "*Laudate Dominum "de cœlis*", etc., is the only one expressly mentioned here, as the "*Miserere*", etc., is the only one expressly mentioned before;[5] but not only the two psalms which are usually joined with it, but the other psalms of lauds may be added, and with them the canticles "*Benedicite*", and "*Benedictus*", and the hymns "*Te Deum*", "*Pange "lingua*", etc., according to the circumstances of time, distance, etc[6]

830. The rubric supposes a priest when carrying the Blessed Sacrament never to be alone. The Sacred Congregation would require him, even when on horseback, to have, if possible, at least one attendant bearing a light.[7] But in Ireland, and other countries similarly circumstanced, he is often without any one to accompany

[1] Caval., l. c. Baruff., n. 189.
[2] Baruff., n. 193.
[3] Supra, n. 805.
[4] Baruff., n. 194. Catal., l. c. n. xix.
[5] Supra, § xiii.
[6] Baruff., l. c. Caval., l. c. Catal., tit. iv. cap. iv. § xxi. n. ii,
[7] 23 Mail, 1846, *Bisinian.*, n. 5036.

him, and in this case he would do well to recite such of those psalms and canticles as he knows by heart.[1]

§ XXVI.—**Cum pervenerit ad Ecclesiam, ponit Sacramentum super Altare, adorat, deinde dicit:** *Panem de cœlo, etc.*

831. Having returned to the church, he ascends the altar, spreads the corporal on the centre, and places the pyxis on it. He then genuflects and descends to the lowest step, on which he kneels in adoration, still retaining the humeral veil, and keeping his hands joined before his breast, until all the people have entered the church.[2] He then rises, and says the versicle "*Panem de cœlo*", etc. In some places, according to Cavalieri[3] and Baruffaldi,[4] "*Tantum ergo*", etc., is previously sung; but Cavalieri shows that the custom is unauthorised and opposed to the rubric, which makes no mention of it, as it does on the return of the procession of Corpus Christi, but directs the versicle to be said at once after the adoration.[5] We have before seen that "*Dominus vobiscum*" is to be said as marked in the ritual.[6]

§ XXVII.—**Deinde annuntiat Indulgentias a Summis Pontificibus concessas Sanctissimum Sacramentum comitantibus.**

832. Having finished the prayer, he genuflects and

[1] Vid. supra, n. 805.
[2] Baruff., n. 195. Caval., cap. v. Decr. xii. n. i. De Herdt, n. 17. i. 18°.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Caval., l. c.
[6] Supra, n. 827.

turning to the people, but taking care not to turn his back to the pyxis, he announces the indulgences granted to those who accompany the Blessed Sacrament. These are: "1° An indulgence of seven years and seven "quarantines, to those who accompany it with a lighted "taper, or any other light. 2° An indulgence of five "years and five quarantines to those who accompany it "without a light. 3° An indulgence of three years and "three quarantines to those who, being lawfully hindered "from going themselves, send some one in their stead to "carry a light in attendance upon the Holy Viaticum. "4° An indulgence of one hundred days to those who "cannot go themselves with the Blessed Sacrament, pro- "vided they say one 'Pater Noster' and one 'Ave Maria' "for the intention of the Pope, when they see it carried "to the sick".[1]

It is not necessary for the priest to mention all these in detail. It is enough for him to announce them in general terms, saying that all who accompanied the Blessed Sacrament with the proper dispositions, have gained the indulgences granted by the Pontiffs.[2]

§ XXVIII.—**Postea cum Sacramento in pyxide, velo cooperta, faciat signum Crucis super populum, nihil dicens. Postremo illud in loco suo reponat.**

833. Having announced the indulgences, he genuflects on the lowest step, and ascends to the predella, where he again genuflects, and taking the pyxis, which he covers

[1] "The Raccolta", *authorized translation*, n. 51. pag. 118. Cfr. Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, II^me^ par. chap. x. § ix.

[2] Baruff., n. 200. Caval., l. c. n. iii. De Herdt, n. 17. i. 19°.

with the humeral veil,[1] he gives the benediction, making the sign of the cross in the manner before explained.[2] On this occasion, however, after moving the pyxis from the left to the right shoulder, he immediately turns to the altar, and (carefully withdrawing the extremities of the humeral veil) places it on the corporal, and then puts it into the tabernacle, genuflecting as before directed.[3] No genuflections are here expressly prescribed by the rubric, but there can be no doubt that they are understood, and they are directed to be made as a matter of course, by all the commentators.[4]

In addition to the two benedictions prescribed by the ritual, others are permitted by custom in some places, or even ordered by the rituals used in particular dioceses.[5] The Sacred Congregation has allowed such customs, where they exist, to be retained.[6]

§ XXIX.—**Quod si ob difficultatem aut longitudinem itineris, vel quia ea qua decet veneratione Sacramentum ad Ecclesiam commode reportari non potest, sumpta fuerit una tantum Particula consecrata, ut dictum est, tunc ea infirmo administrata, Sacerdos, prædictis precibus recitatis, cum manu benedicit, et una cum aliis privato habita, extinctis luminibus, umbella demissa, latente pyxide, ad Ecclesiam, vel domum quisque suam revertatur.**

834. When the journey is long or difficult, or when the priest has to go on horseback, only one particle is to

[1] Baruff., n. 201. Caval., l. c. n. iv.
[2] Supra, n. **828.**
[3] Supra, chap. xii. § x.
[4] Caval., l. c. Baruff., l. c., etc., etc.
[5] Vid. De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 17. i. 19⁰.
[6] 7 April, 1832, *Massæ et Popul.*, ad 2. n. 4685.

be brought, according to a previous rubric.[1] Many other cases are mentioned by authors, in which the same rule is to be followed, as, when it must be brought at night, when the weather is rainy, or the like.[2] Indeed the present rubric seems to include every case in which the Blessed Sacrament cannot be carried in public with suitable marks of reverence. St. Charles adds also the case in which it is foreseen that Extreme Unction must be administered immediately after the Viaticum.[3]

835. When only a single particle is brought, the priest is here instructed, after administering the communion, to recite the preceding versicles and prayers, and give the benediction with his hand. He should give the benediction in the same manner as after communion in the church,[4] raising his eyes, extending his hands, etc.[5] The form there prescribed is "*Benedictio . . . . descendat super "vos*" . . . and no author that we have seen suggests a change of number here. Cavalieri[6] even gives the form here in full, with the plural "*super vos*". We have no authority, then, for a change of number, but it appears to us that the reasons why the form "*Misereatur tui*", etc., is used instead of "*Misereatur vestri*", etc., in administering the Viaticum, would require or justify here the use of the form "*Benedictio . . . descendat super te*" . . .[7]

[1] Supra, § xii.

[2] Baruff., n. 116. Cavalieri, cap. v. Decr. vii. n. vii. De Herdt, n. 18. iii.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. *Instruct. Visit. Inf.*, § *De Communione*, pag. 445.

[4] Baruff., n. 202. Caval., Decr. xii. n. v. De Herdt, n. 18. iii.

[5] Vid. supra, n. 700. [6] Loc. cit.

[7] Vid. supra, n. 818.

836. Having given the benediction, the priest takes off his sacred vestments, and, with his attendants, returns to the church, or each may go to his own house. The lights are extinguished, the canopy lowered or folded up, and the pyxis concealed so as to avoid anything which might indicate that the priest is carrying the Blessed Sacrament.

837. When the priest brings only one particle, he may purify the pyxis immediately after giving communion, and he will often find it very convenient to do so.[1] He may proceed thus. Holding it with his left hand over the vessel prepared for the ablution of his fingers, he collects, with the index of his right, any fragments he may perceive, and makes them fall into the vessel. Then, if necessary, he pours a little water into the pyxis, and having made it pass round the interior, pours it into the vessel. He then washes his fingers and dries them with the purificator. If the pyxis be large enough, he may hold his thumb and index over it, and wash them with the water which he pours into it. The ablution is then given to the sick person as directed before.[2]

838. The rubric makes no provision for a case which may easily occur, and which is, in fact, of frequent occurrence in Ireland—that, namely, in which the priest must carry the Blessed Sacrament privately and without attendants, but finds it necessary, at the same time, to bring more than one particle in the pyxis, as he may have to administer the viaticum to several sick persons in different houses before he returns to the church or to his

[1] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi n. 251. *Hic autem.*

[2] Supra, n. 826.

own house. Is he, in this case, after giving commu to give benediction of the Blessed Sacrament as a directed?[1] We have not seen the case discussed in author, but we think he should. The rubric seem prescribe it in every case in which a particle remai the pyxis "si altera particula sacramenti superfuerit" these circumstances we think the priest should put pyxis into its case or covering, and give the benedi with it thus covered. He should then fasten it roun neck as before directed,[2] and after this, but not soo he may lay aside the stole and surplice.

When he returns to the place where he keeps Blessed Sacrament,[3] he should say the versicle and prayer "*Deus qui nobis*", etc., prescribed in the ru It is unnecessary for him to place the pyxis on the a if he can put it at once into the tabernacle, but he mu careful to genuflect before closing the door.[4]

839. In Holy Week, from the mass of Holy Thur till the mass of Holy Saturday, communion can be a nistered only "per modum viatici".[5] If the Blessed crament be brought to the sick during this time, the lowing rules should be observed, according to a decre the Sacred Congregation.[6] 1° The colour of the should be white. 2° The psalms may be recited with "*Gloria Patri*", etc., at the end, but they are to be cited in a very low tone. 3° Benediction is not t given in the church, nor is the Blessed Sacrament t

[1] Supra, § xxv.
[2] Supra, n. 807.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 598.
[4] Vid. supra, chap. xii. §
[5] Vid. supra, n. 711.
[6] 15 Maii, 1745, *Lucana*, n. 4170.

brought back to the altar of the church, but to be placed elsewhere.[1] The benediction with the pyxis, however, in the chamber of the sick person may be given.[2]

840. The viaticum can seldom be administered "intra "missam", for it has been decided by the Sacred Congregation,[3] that the priest cannot give communion "intra "missam", if he has to go to a place from which the altar is not visible. It may happen, however, that a person who is to receive the viaticum is in good health, and able to assist at mass, as *e.g.*, a criminal about to be executed;[4] or it may be, in a hospital or in a private house where mass is allowed to be celebrated, that the sick person is within view of the altar. In this case communion may be administered to him "intra missam". The ceremonies to be observed are exactly the same as those prescribed for communion in the church "intra missam",[5] with the sole exception of the formula, which should be "*Accipe frater*", etc., if the communion be administered as the viaticum".[6] The colour of the vestments is, of course, that which is suited to the mass, and may be even black.[7] This is the only case in which communion is given to the sick in a stole of any other colour than white.[8]

841. If the viaticum be administered to two or more

[1] Vid. Caval., vol. iv. cap. i. *De Feria V. in Cœna Domini*, Decr. ix. n. i. et cap. v. *De Com. Infirm.*, Decr. xii. n. vii.

[2] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 18. i.

[3] 19 Decr., 1829, *in una Florentin.*, ad 1. n. 4651.

[4] Vid. supra, n. 773. [5] Supra, chap. xii. § xiii.

[6] De Herdt, n. 18. ii.

[7] S. C. R., Decr. cit. *in una Florentin.*, ad 2. De Herdt, ibid.

[8] Vid. supra, n. 799.

at the same time, as may happen in a hospital, o
in a private house, where several members of the
may be prostrated by fever or some other inf
disease, it may be administered to them successivel
as communion is administered in the church, pr
they be in the same apartment, or even in adj
apartments opening into each other. This is the c
of De Herdt,[1] and of the "Melanges Theologiques'
there seems no reason why it may not be acted on.

In this case, the salutation at entrance, the spri
of holy water, the versicles and prayer "*Exaudi*
may serve for all in common.

After the "*Confiteor*", "*Misereatur vestri*", etc.,
be said in the plural.

The ablution of the fingers may be given to any
them, and need not be divided.

In the prayer "*Domine sancte*", etc., "*fratri*
"(*vel sorori nostræ*)", should be changed into "*fr*
"*nostris*", or, if all be females, "*sororibus nostris*".[3]

Lastly, the benediction with the pyxis may be gi
all together.

[1] Pars. vi. n. 24. ii.
[2] VI^me^ Serie, 3^me^ Cahier, pag. 503.
[3] Vid. supra, n. **365.**

CHAPTER XV.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

DE SACRAMENTO EXTREMÆ UNCTIONIS.

§ I.—**Extremæ Unctionis Sacramentum a Christo Domino institutum, tanquam cœlestis medicina non animæ solum, sed etiam corpori salutaris, omni studio ac diligentia periculose ægrotantibus adhibendum est, et eo quidem tempore, si fieri possit, cum illis adhuc integra mens et ratio viget, ut ad uberiorem Sacramenti gratiam percipiendam ipsi etiam suam fidem ac piam animi voluntatem conferre possint, dum sacro liniuntur Oleo.**

842. This sacrament, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[1] is called "Extreme Unction", because, amongst the other sacred unctions which are used in the Church, this is the last to be administered. The other unctions are those used in Baptism, Confirmation, Ordination, and certain Consecrations.[2] Another reason why it is so called may be because it is administered to the faithful only when they are labouring under some bodily infirmity which warns them that they may have nearly reached the *extreme* term of life. Hence it is called by the Council of Trent "Unctio infirmorum",[3] and

[1] Pars. ii. cap. vi. n. 2.
[2] Catal., tit. v. n. i.
[3] Sess. xiv. *De Ext. Unc.*, cap. i.

"Sacramentum exeuntium".[1] It is called by the Greeks Εὐχέλαιον, *i. e.* (from Εὐχὴ, and Ἔλαίον), unction with prayer, and also τὸ Ἅγιον Ἔλαίον, *i. e.* The Holy Oil.

843. The Council of Trent has defined that Extreme Unction is a true sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the apostle St. James.[2] The proof of the Catholic doctrine from the well known text of this apostle "Infirmatur quis in vobis", etc.,[3] is fully developed by Bellarmine,[4] who shows that the unction there mentioned has all the conditions necessary to a true sacrament, and refutes the objections of the heretics.

844. The rubric here states that Extreme Unction has been instituted by our Lord as a celestial medicine for the health not only of the soul, but of the body also. It is certain that it produces sanctifying grace like the other sacraments, and has at the same time, like each of them, certain effects peculiar to itself.[5] Of these the principal, according to St. Liguori,[6] resting on the authority of St. Thomas, is to remove the spiritual torpor and weakness which are the result of actual sin, and which are most probably meant by the "reliquias peccati", mentioned by the Council of Trent.[7] This effect, so explained, is closely connected with the other spiritual effects mentioned by the council. Indeed they may be said in some degree to suppose each other, for the grace of the sacrament, we are there taught, " . . . . . raises up and strengthens

[1] Ibid. cap. iii.
[2] Sess. xiv. *De Ext. Unct.*, can. i.
[3] Cap. v. 14–15.
[4] *De Extrema Unctione*, cap. ii. et iii.
[5] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 6. not. v.
[6] Lib. vi. n. 731. *Secunda Sententia*, in fine.
[7] Sess. xiv. *De Ext. Unct.*, cap. ii.

"the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great "confidence in the divine mercy; whereby the sick being "supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains "of his sickness, and more readily resists the temptations "of the devil, who 'lies in wait for his heel' (*Gen.*, iii. 15)".[1] All these may be regarded as constituting the primary effect intended in the institution of the sacrament.[2] Many hold that this effect supposes a spiritual infirmity resulting from actual sin, and that therefore no one who has not committed actual sin can validly receive the sacrament. This is the opinion of St. Thomas, who says that Extreme Unction cannot be administered to infants, because . . . "non datur contra reliquias originalis peccati nisi secun- "dum quod sunt per actualia peccata quodam modo con- "fortatæ".[3] It is maintained, however, by Suarez and many others, that, to be a fit subject for the sacrament, it is enough that one be capable of sinning and have that spiritual infirmity which results from original sin.[4] Suarez even holds that one, by nature liable to contract original sin, though by a special privilege exempted from it, could receive the primary effect of the sacrament, and that therefore the Blessed Virgin could receive, and more probably did receive, Extreme Unction, as well as Baptism.[5]

845. The second effect is the remission of sin; not only venial, but mortal sin, if the person be properly disposed. It is true that, being one of the "sacramenta vivorum", it is not instituted primarily for the remission of sin, like

[1] Loc. cit. Waterworth's translation.
[2] Vid. Suarez, *De Ext. Unct.*, Disp. xli. sect i. n. 11 et seq.
[3] *Supplem.*, Quæs. 32, art. 4. ad. 2.
[4] Disp. xlii. sect. ii. n. 7 et seq. [5] Loc. cit. n. 10 et 11.

Baptism or Penance.[1] Hence it requires that the reci
be in the state of grace. The rubric even directs[2] th
a general rule, he should have already received the s
ment of Penance and the Viaticum. But should it
pen from any cause, that he is still in the state o
being invincibly ignorant of it, this sacrament rec
with attrition will restore him to the state of grace,
clearly inferred from the words of St. James: "Et
peccatis sit remittentur ei".[3] This effect of remitting s
has, not merely *per accidens*, like the Eucharist or the
"sacramenta vivorum", but *per se*, as being directly in
ded in its institution, though not as its principal effec

846. A third effect which it sometimes has, is, to
tore the health of the body. The first effect, alre
explained, includes a certain alleviation of the bo
infirmity, which is often very perceptible, as many pr
can attest from experience; but besides, the sick per
by virtue of this sacrament, "at times obtains bodily he
"when expedient for the welfare of the soul".[5] Wh
and how far it *is* expedient in any particular case, can
known only to God; but it is not implied that one w
is restored to health by virtue of the sacrament will
severe and be saved, or that one who is not so resto
would not acquire greater merit and a higher degre
glory, if he were permitted to live longer. The nat
of the resulting spiritual advantage on which the rest

[1] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 6. Not. 1. [2] Infra, § ii
[3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 731, *Commune est.*
[4] St. Lig., l. c. *Secunda Sententia.* Vid. Suarez, Disp. xli. sec
Assertio II[a] n. 14 et seq.
[5] Conc. Trid., l. c.

tion of bodily health depends, is altogether determined by the order of God's wisdom and providence, and does not necessarily imply final perseverance.[1]

It is observed by St. Liguori that this effect, though due to the supernatural virtue of the sacrament, is not produced "per modum miraculi", but by the operation of natural causes assisted by the sacrament.[2]

847. It is to be administered only to those who are in danger of death from sickness— "periculose ægrotanti-"bus", but if possible while they have the perfect use of their faculties, for, as the rubric here states, their own good dispositions make them receive more abundant grace from the sacrament. Besides, as St. Liguori observes,[3] if administered in time it might restore the sick person to health, whereas it cannot have this effect when the powers of nature are completely exhausted, since it does not operate "per modum miraculi". "It is a very grievous sin", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "to defer "the Holy Unction until, all hope of recovery now lost, "life begins to ebb and the sick person is sinking into "insensibility. It is obvious that, if administered whilst "the mental faculties are yet unimpaired and the sick man "can bring to its reception sentiments of faith and devo-"tion, this circumstance must contribute very much to "enable him to partake more abundantly of the graces of "the sacrament".[4] It is an important duty of the pastor, then, to instruct the faithful on this subject, and to remove the senseless fear which many of them entertain

[1] Vid. Suarez, l. c. sec. iv.
[2] Lib. vi. n. 714. *Advertendum autem*, 1.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Pars. ii cap. vi. n. 9.

of receiving Extreme Unction, as if it cut off all hop recovery.[1]

§ II.—In quo illud in primis ex generali Eccl consuetudine observandum est, ut si tempus, et ini conditio permittat, ante Extremam Unctionem, Pœnite et Eucharistiæ Sacramenta infirmis præbeantur.

848. It is here directed that if circumstances per the sick person should receive the sacraments of Pena and the Holy Eucharist before Extreme Unction. It r easily happen that he is not in a condition to receive Viaticum, as, *e. g.* if he be afflicted with vomit.[2] In case Extreme Unction may be administered before Viaticum, which he may be able to receive afterwa In fact Martene shows by abundant testimonies that ac ding to the ancient discipline of the Church, Extr Unction was usually administered before the Viatic and according to St. Liguori it would hardly be eve venial sin to follow the same order at present.[4]

849. But it is very hard to conceive a case in wh the sacrament of Penance may not be administered f Extreme Unction can be administered only by a pri and it is certain that any priest can hear and absolve who is a fit subject for Extreme Unction; for, to be subject for Extreme Unction, he must be "in peric "mortis",[5] and any priest can absolve one who is "in p

[1] Vid. Benedict XV., *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib., viii. cap. vii. n. 2.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 782.
[3] *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. i. cap. vii. art. ii. n. iii.
[4] Lib. vi. n. 716. Cfr. Benedict XV., *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. viii. ns. 1. et 2.
[5] Vid. infra, § vi.

"culo mortis".[1] If the sick person, therefore, has the use of his faculties, there is plainly nothing to prevent him from receiving Penance when it is possible for him to receive Extreme Unction. There *can* be nothing, unless we fancy an almost incredible amount of ignorance or perversity on the part of the priest.[2]

850. Nay more, if he be conscious of mortal sin, he cannot licitly receive Extreme Unction, as being one of the "sacramenta vivorum", until he has recovered the state of grace either by perfect contrition or by receiving the sacrament of Penance.[3] In strictness, no doubt, it suffices that he elicit an act of contrition before Extreme Unction; but being in danger of death and having the opportunity, he is certainly bound to confess either before or immediately after, and bound too even by the divine precept which urges precisely in his circumstances.[4] Hence, if he had reason to fear that he would not have time, or would be unable, to confess after receiving Extreme Unction, he would be bound to go to confession first. According to Suarez,[5] he would not be justified in even abridging his confession, or leaving it incomplete in order that he might have time to receive Extreme Unction. Penance is necessary to him, "*necessitate medii*",[6] and in his present state the divine precept of confession actually urges,[7] whereas Extreme Unction is necessary at most "*necessitate præcepti*", and accord-

[1] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 561.
[2] Vid. Suarez, Disp. xliv. sect. i. n. 7.
[3] Lacroix, lib. vi. pars. ii. n. 1108.
[4] De Lugo, *De Pœnitentia*, Disp. xv. sec. iii. n. 37.
[5] Loc. cit. n. 9. [6] Con. Trid. Sess. xiv. cap. ii,
[7] De Lugo, l. c.

ing to many theologians, the precept *of itself* does n bind *sub gravi*.[1] One in his circumstances, then, is som times strictly bound, and should, in every case, be ea nestly recommended, to receive Penance first.[2]

If he be not conscious of mortal sin, he is not, is true, bound to go to confession; but if he desires to g the priest is certainly bound to hear him, and as there a few Christians who, at the hour of death, have not th desire, even though they be not conscious of mortal si the rule for the priest is, to administer the sacrament Penance, or at least give the sick person an opportuni of receiving it, before he administers Extreme Unction.

851. If he has not the use of his faculties, it is indee possible that he might receive Extreme Unction valid and with fruit, although absolution, in the same circun stances, would be null. We may conceive a person in th state of mortal sin, and having attrition, which still morall continues, but who is now unconscious, and utterly unabl to make any sign that would be a manifestation of so row or an acknowled gment of sin. If he were absolved i these circumstances, the absolution would be null, perhap for want of the necessary intention,[3] but at all events "e "defectu materiæ sacramenti".[4] This is certain accordin to the Thomist theory regarding the matter of the sacr ment, which is the theory now almost universally adopted and it can hardly be denied even in the Scotist theor

[1] St. Lig., n. 733.

[2] Vid. Suarez, l. c., n. 9, 10, 11. [3] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 447.

[4] De Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, Disp. ix. sect. vii. n. 124, et *De Pœni tentia*, Disp. xvii. sec. iii. n. 39. Suarez, Disp. xxiii. sec. i. n. 13 Lacroix., lib. vi. par. ii. n. 1161. St. Lig., n. 483.

which requires confession of some kind, not indeed as an essential part of the sacrament, but as a condition absolutely indispensable to its effect.[1] Such a one, however, could receive Extreme Unction validly,[2] and being attrite would be restored by it to the state of grace.[3]

All this is perfectly true, and if the priest could be certain that any one is precisely in these circumstances, he should not absolve him, but at once administer Extreme Unction. But we believe he can never be certain of this, and in the doubt he may, and ought to, give absolution *sub conditione*.[4]

We conclude, therefore, that in practice there is no case in which Penance may not be administered absolutely or conditionally before Extreme Unction.

§ III.—**Habeat igitur Parochus loco nitido et decenter ornato, in vase argenteo seu stanneo, diligenter custoditum sacrum Oleum infirmorum, quod singulis annis Feria V. in Cœna Domini ab Episcopo benedictum, veteri combusto, renovandum est.**

852. The matter of this sacrament, according to the Council of Trent,[5] is "oil blessed by the bishop". The oil is understood to be "oil of olives", for the word used simply and without any qualification, has this meaning; and besides, in the decree of Eugene IV., "Pro Arme-"nis", the matter is said to be "oleum olivæ per episco-"pum benedictum".[6]

[1] Vid. Billuart, *De Pœnitentia*, Dissert. i. art. ii. *Dico* 5° et seq.
[2] Vid. infra, § vii. [3] St. Lig., n. 731, *Commune est.*
[4] St. Lig., l. c. Lacroix, l. c. n. 1162.
[5] Sess. xiv. *De Ext. Unct*, cap. i.
[6] Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, lxxiii. n. 595. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 708, *Certum est.*

It is the common opinion of theologians, founded on the words of the councils, that the benediction is not merely required by precept, but is essential to the sacrament.[1] They are not, however, agreed as to the necessity of a special benediction. Some eminent theologians, amongst others Suarez,[2] maintain that oil blessed in any way by the bishop is sufficient for the validity of the sacrament, because it is still true to say that it is "oleum "ab episcopo benedictum"; while others no less eminent maintain that it is not sufficient, unless it be specially blessed for this sacrament.[3]

853. Hence, in case of necessity, but not otherwise, Extreme Unction might be administered conditionally with Chrism or Oil of Catechumens; and if the proper oil can afterwards be had, the sacrament should again be conferred.[4] St. Liguori says nothing of a condition in this repetition of the ceremony. Neither does St. Charles in ordering a repetition in case of mistake as to the oil, even though the oil used had been Chrism or Oil of Catechumens.[5] Lacroix, however, says that the sacrament should be repeated in this case *sub conditione*,[6] and we think there should be a condition, at least implied in the intention, unless the state of the disease has changed in the meantime, so that the sacrament might be simply repeated.[7]

854. In the Latin Church the oil is always blessed

[1] St. Lig., n. 709.
[2] Disp. xl. sect. i. n. 9.
[3] St. Lig., ibid *Dub.* 2.
[4] St. Lig., ibid.
[5] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. Instruct. Extr. Unct. § *De diligentia in ministrando*, pag. 450.
[6] Lib. vi. pars. ii. n. 2090.
[7] Vid. infra, § xiv.

by a bishop, and it was decided by a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition approved by Gregory XVI.,[1] that, even in case of necessity, a priest cannot use for Extreme Unction oil blessed by himself.

In the Greek Church, however, it is blessed by simple priests; and there can be no doubt that this benediction suffices. It is certain, therefore, notwithstanding the contrary opinion of some theologians, that a simple priest, when expressly or tacitly commissioned by the Pope, can validly bless the oil for this sacrament. . . . "Res videtur "exploratissima, quam nemini liceat in quæstionem ad- "ducere", are the words of Benedict XIV.[2]

The holy oils are blessed by the bishop on Holy Thursday, and should be renewed every year, what remains of the old oils being burned in the manner before explained.[3]

855. The present rubric directs that the "Oleum In- "firmorum" be kept in a silver or tin vessel, in a place perfectly clean and suitably ornamented. Baruffaldi[4] recommends that it be kept in a press or safe placed in the wall of the church on the Gospel side of the high altar, or altar where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, so that a lamp may be always burning before it; and that the door of the press have on it in legible characters "SANC- "TUM OLEUM INFIRMORUM". The first synod of Westminster ordered that, in the erection of new churches, provision should be made for keeping it in this

[1] 14 Sept., 1842, Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, cxxv.
[2] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. i. n. 4.
[3] Vid. supra, chap. iii. § xxxiii. et seq.
[4] Tit. xxvii. n. 40 et seq.

manner,[1] and it is the most suitable provision where it can be effected.[2] The rubrics undoubtedly suppose that, at least as a general rule, it is kept in the Church, and the Sacred Congregation having been consulted on the subject, decided[3] that a priest is not justified by any existing custom in keeping it in his house, unless when he lives at a great distance from the church.[4]

856. In Ireland, however, and in other countries similarly circumstanced, the priest is, generally speaking, obliged to keep it in his house, but he is certainly bound, as the Sacred Congregation adds in the decision just referred to, to observe what the rubric prescribes, "quoad "honestam et decentem tutamque custodiam". Should he have permission to keep the Blessed Sacrament in his house, as he usually has,[5] he is not permitted to put the holy oil in the tabernacle with the Blessed Sacrament, this being prohibited by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops,[6] but he can easily provide a suitable place for it in the room or oratory where he keeps the Blessed Sacrament. He might have a small drawer for the purpose immediately beside the tabernacle. We think the drawer might be put even in the framework of the tabernacle, under or at either side, without any infringement of the decree.

§ IV.—**Id tamen si forte infra annum aliquo modo ita deficiat, ut sufficere non posse videatur, neque aliud**

[1] Decr. xx. *De Sac. Ext. Unc.*, 4°.
[2] Vid. supra, chap. iii. § xxxix.
[3] 16 Dec., 1826, *in una Gandaven.*, ad Quæs iii. n. 4623.
[4] Vid. *Annotationem*, in Decr. cit.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 598. [6] Vid. supra, n. 612.

benedictum haberi queat, modico oleo non benedicto in minori quantitate superinfuso, reparari potest.

857. What was said in a preceding chapter[1] regarding the oil and chrism used in Baptism, may be repeated here regarding the "Oleum infirmorum". If during the year the supply becomes nearly exhausted, and a further supply cannot easily be procured, unblessed oil may be added, but in less quantity; and this too as often as may be necessary, although what is thus added, taking all the additions together, may exceed in quantity what was first blessed.[2]

Should there be any delay in procuring the new oil blessed on Holy Thursday, the old oil may be used, but only in case of necessity.[3] We have already dwelt on the obligation of the pastor to procure a timely supply of the holy oils after their consecration,[4] and it is enough to observe here, that Benedict XIV.,[5] and the continuator of Gardellini,[6] urge this obligation as strictly with reference to the "Oleum infirmorum", as with reference to the oils required in Baptism.

§ V.—**Oleum porro ipsum vel per se solum, vel in bombacio, seu re simili servari potest; sed ad evitandum effusionis periculum multo commodius ad infirmos defertur in bombacio.**

858. Besides the vessel for containing the annual sup-

[1] Chap. iii. § xxxiv. et seq.
[2] Supra, n. **857, 858.**
[3] Gavant., *Manuale Episcoporum*, V. Ext. Unct. n. 10.
[4] Supra, n. **851** et seq.
[5] *Instit.*, lxxx. n. 8.
[6] *Annot.* in Decr. 16 Dec. 1826, *in una Gandaven.*, ad iv. n. 4623.

ply, there should be another smaller one of silver and legibly marked, to contain what is immediately required for use, absorbed in a little cotton or other like material as here recommended by the rubric.[1]

§ VI.—**Debet autem hoc Sacramentum infirmis præberi, qui cum ad usum rationis pervenerint, tam graviter laborant, ut mortis periculum imminere videatur; et iis qui præ senio deficiunt, et in diem videntur morituri etiam sine alia infirmitate.**

859. This rubric determines the subject of Extreme Unction. It is to be administered only to those who are in danger of death from disease already affecting the body. The words of St. James Ἀσθενεῖ τις and κάμνοντα,[2] imply that the person is labouring under a dangerous illness. Such is their usual acceptation,[3] and so they are interpreted by the unanimous consent of theologians.[4] Hence its administration to one in sound health or to one but slightly indisposed, would be, according to the common opinion, not only illicit but invalid. The practice observed in the Greek Church of anointing all who are present when the oils are blessed on Holy Thursday, is sometimes urged as an objection, but this practice is to be understood as merely a pious ceremony, and not as a sacramental unction.[5]

It is enough, however, that a person is prudently judged, from the apparent symptoms, to be in danger, even though the danger does not really exist. This appears to be con-

[1] Vid. chap. iii. n. **261** et seq.
[2] Cap. v. 14, 15.
[3] Vid. Estium in loc.
[4] Bened. XV. *De Syn. Dioc.*, Lib. viii. cap. v. n. 5.
[5] St. Lig. lib vi. n. 713. Bened. XV. l. c.

veyed in the present rubric, which requires only that one be so ill, "**ut mortis periculum imminere videatur**".[1]

As soon, then, as it can be prudently pronounced that one is in danger of death from sickness, even though the danger be not proximate, even though there be a hope of recovery, the sacrament may be administered: and there is a strict obligation as we have seen[2] of not deferring it till the last moment.[3]

860. It is to be administered only to those who have had the use of reason. It cannot be administered even validly to children who have not yet attained the use of reason, for as they are incapable of yielding to temptation, it could not have, with regard to them, the primary effect before explained;[4] nor, failing this, any of its secondary effects.[5] But it may be administered to children who have attained the use of reason, although it be judged inexpedient to admit them as yet to Holy Communion.[6] Benedict XIV. lays it down as a principle, that when children are considered capable of receiving the sacrament of Penance, they may be also considered capable of receiving Extreme Unction: "Quandocumque censentur capaces Sacramenti Penitentiæ, sunt pariter idonei repu-tandi ad Extremam Unctionem, quae est illius complementum, quamvis nondum tantâ polleant judicii maturitate ut videantur apti ad rite participandam Eucharistiam, de cujus ineffabili excellentiâ et sanctitate non ita facile edoceri queunt".[7]

[1] Vid. St. Lig., n. 714.
[2] Supra, n. 847.
[3] Vid. St. Lig., l. c. *Advertendum*, 1 et 2.
[4] Supra, n. 844.
[5] St. Lig., n. 718.
[6] St. Lig., n. 720.
[7] *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. vi. n. 2.

Hence, although the Viaticum, as has been said in a previous chapter,[1] should be sometimes administered to children sooner than they would be, in the ordinary course, admitted to first communion, it would appear that Extreme Unction may be administered to them at a still earlier age than the Viaticum. When it is doubted whether a child has attained the use of reason, the sacrament should be conferred conditionally.[2]

861. It should be administered to those who are sinking from old age, although they may have no other infirmity, for this is in itself an infirmity sufficiently comprehended under the terms used by the apostle.

§ VII.—**Infirmis autem, qui dum sana mente et integris sensibus essent, illud petierint, seu verisimiliter petiissent, seu dederint signa contritionis, etiamsi deinde loquelam amiserint, vel amentes effecti sint, vel delirent, aut non sentiant, nihilominus præbeatur.**

862. The different kinds of intention distinguished by theologians, have been already noticed.[3] It appears from the present rubric that for Extreme Unction, it is sufficient that the sick person have an *interpretative* intention, in other words, that he *would have* the intention of receiving it if he had now the use of his faculties, though in point of fact he has not, and may never have had formally and explicitly such intention.[4] An intention or disposition of this kind is rightly presumed in all who have lived as Catholics, unless there be evidence to

[1] Chap. xi. n. 640.
[2] St. Lig., n. 719. Baruff., tit. xxvii. n. 62.
[3] Chap. ii. n. 137. [4] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 89.

the contrary;[1] and hence it is to be administered to those who have fallen into delirium, not only when it is known that they desired it, or desired the assistance of a priest before falling into that state, but also when it is ascertained that they lived as Catholics.

It is in such circumstances—when the person is unable to make any sign of sorrow or acknowledgment of sin—that the case already discussed may arise; that, namely, in which Extreme Unction can be validly administered while penance cannot, and in which, therefore, the salvation of one who is dying may depend on his receiving Extreme Unction.[2]

§ VIII.—**Sed si infirmus, dum phrenesi aut amentia laborat, verisimiliter posset quidquam facere contra reverentiam Sacramenti, non inungatur, nisi periculum tollatur omnino.**

863. Those who have been insane from infancy are incapable of receiving this sacrament, for the reason already assigned in the case of infants.[3] But if they have had at any time a lucid interval, it is to be administered, if it can be, without danger of irreverence. To prevent this danger, they may be held or bound, at least in circumstances in which the sacrament may be judged necessary.[4] If there be a doubt as to whether the person has ever had a lucid interval, it should be administered, but according to St. Liguori "sub conditione".[5]

[1] Baruff., n. 67. Lacroix, lib. vi. par. i. n. 172.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 851.
[3] Supra, n. 860. Benedict XIV., lib. viii. cap. vi. n. 3.
[4] Baruff., n. 70. Lacroix, lib. vi. par. ii. n. 2110.
[5] Lib. vi. n. 732, in parenth.

§ IX.—*Impœnitentibus vero, et qui manifesto peccato mortali moriuntur, et excommunicatis, et nondum baptismatis pœnitus denegetur.*

864. The rubric here enumerates certain classes to whom the sacrament cannot be administered. By the impenitent are understood those who are known to have been guilty of grievous sin, and who give no reason to think that they have since repented.[1] It is not to be administered to one who is manifestly dying in mortal sin—to a murderer, for example, who is seized with a fatal illness, or receives a mortal wound in the act of killing his victim.

If such a one, however, survives even for a short time, and gives signs of repentance, he may be absolved,[2] and there is no reason why he may not be anointed also; for it cannot be said of him that he is dying "*in manifesto peccato mortali*". But if he be deprived of his senses in the very act of sin, though he may be absolved conditionally, according to St. Liguori,[3] the present rubric would seem to deny him Extreme Unction. Some theologians, however, would permit him to be anointed.[4] Bouvier[5] and Scavini[6] say that the same rule is to be followed in administering Extreme Unction as in giving absolution. In practice we would act on this opinion, and anoint as well as absolve, unless there be evident signs of impenitence.

865. It cannot be conferred on one who is excommu-

[1] Baruff., n. 72.
[2] Vid. St. Lig., n. 483.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Vid. Baruff., n. 76. Clericatum, *De Ext. Unct.*, Decis. lxxx. n. 6.
[5] *De Ext. Unct.*, cap. vii. art. iii. 7°.
[6] *De Ext. Unct.*, Disp. ii. cap. iv. Quær. 2, *Impœnitentibus*, etc.

nicated, until he is first absolved from the excommunication; but this cannot, we think, present much difficulty in practice, if the person be otherwise disposed and prepared to receive the sacrament; for if so, he must have sorrow for the offence by which he incurred excommunication, and be anxious to be reconciled to the Church, and being also, as must be supposed, "in periculo mortis", he can be absolved from the censure by any priest.[1]

866. The rubric says nothing of interdict, but we may observe that if it be *personal*, what has just been said of excommunication may be applied to it. If it be *local*, however, Extreme Unction cannot be administered to any in the place except in case of necessity, according to Collet;[2] but St. Liguori gives it as the common opinion, that it may be administered to religious, and cites, without disapproval, the opinion of some who maintain that it may be administered generally.[3]

867. Those who are not yet baptized are incapable of receiving this or any other sacrament.[4] But if an adult be baptized in a dangerous illness, or fall into a dangerous illness immediately after receiving baptism, Extreme Unction should be administered to him, for though baptism remits all sin both as to guilt and punishment,[5] it does not produce what is the primary effect of Extreme Unction, for it does not remove the torpor and weakness which are the result of sin, nor give a special strength against the temptations of the devil in the last agony.[6]

[1] Vid. Gury, *De Censuris*, cap. i. art. iv. n. 952.
[2] *De Censuris*, cap. iii. art. ii. [3] Lib. vii. n. 334 in parenth.
[4] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 79.
[5] Conc. Trid. Sess. V., *Decr. de Peccat. Origin.*, § v.
[6] St. Lig., n. 721. Vid. supra, n. 844.

§ X.—Non ministretur etiam prælium initurís, aut navigationem, aut peregrinationem aut alia pericula subituris, aut reis ultimo supplicio mox afficiendis, aut pueris rationis usum non habentibus.

868. It has been already stated that the subject of Extreme Unction must be in danger of death from some infirmity actually affecting the person to whom it is administered.[1] It is not enough that he be in danger of death, or even certain of suffering death, by violence or from any external cause. Hence it cannot be administered to those mentioned in the present rubric—to soldiers entering the field of battle, to persons undertaking a perilous voyage or journey, or to criminals about to be executed. But if any of these has already suffered what is sufficient to cause death—if a soldier, for instance, is mortally wounded, or if a criminal after hearing his sentence gets into a fever, or if he is mortally injured by a fall from the scaffold, or if, being condemned to die by slow torture, he has already suffered enough to cause death,—in any such case Extreme Unction may be administered if there be an opportunity, since there is then a dangerous ailment actually affecting the body.[2]

869. Women cannot be anointed on account of the ordinary pains of childbirth, but if these be very severe, and such as to endanger life, the sacrament may be administered.[3]

We have seen under a preceding rubric that it cannot be administered to children who have not the use of reason.[4]

[1] Supra, n. 859.
[2] Baruff., n. 83, 84. Clericatus, Decis. lxxix. n. 34 et seq.
[3] St. Lig., n. 718, Dub. 8. [4] Vid. supra, n. 860.

§ XI.—**Si quis autem laborat in extremis, et periculum immineat, ne decedat antequam liniantur Unctiones, cito ungatur, incipiendo ab eo loco:** *Per istam sanctam Unctionem, etc.*, **ut infra: deinde si adhuc supervivat, dicantur Orationes prætermissæ suo loco positæ.**

870. Several questions of great importance in practice are suggested under this rubric. When there is reason to apprehend that the sick person may die before the whole ceremony as given in the ritual can be performed, the priest is here directed to omit what precedes, and commence with the application of the matter and form, and afterwards, if the person survives, to supply what has been omitted. There is no difficulty, if time permits the unction of the five organs of sense,[1] with the form appropriate to each; but if there is not time, or, what comes to the same, if it is feared there will not be time for this, how is the priest to act? It would seem from the rubrics that he should proceed with the usual unctions as far as he can, and cease if death takes place before he has completed them.

871. But theologians commonly teach that in this case he should apply a single unction, with the form expressing all the senses. St. Liguori recommends him to pronounce the form as follows: "*Per istam sanctam* "*Unctionem et suam pissimam misericordiam indulgeat* "*tibi Dominus quicquid deliquisti per sensus, visum, audi-* "*tum, gustum, odoratum, et tactum*", putting the word "*deliquisti*" before the expression of the senses; for should the person expire before it is pronounced, the

[1] Vid. infra, § xv.

sacrament would be null.[1] Benedict XIV., speaking of this case, says: "Parochos monebit (episcopus) ut cum "prudenter timent ægrotum decessurum priusquam omnes "absolvantur quinque sensuum unctiones, unicum sensum "inungant formam universalem pronuntiando. . . .; qui- "nimo in prædicto eventu consultius esse ut caput, e quo "omnium sensuum nervi descendunt, sub eâdem formâ "universali inungatur, non immerito advertit Coninck "(*De Sacram.* disp. 19, dub. iii., n. 2). Ne veró parochi "hac libertate abutantur, expedit ut episcopus simul serio "eosdem admoneat a gravis culpæ reatu non excusari "qui extra casum veræ necessitatis vel unam ex quinque "sensuum unctionibus prætermittit".[2] St. Liguori says: "Tempore pestis, vel alia urgente necessitate, poterit ad- "hiberi sub conditione una unctio in aliquo sensu (et "consultius in capite)".[3]

872. It is not stated by either of these authorities to what part of the head this single unction should be applied; but they seem to convey that the part is not one of the organs, as *e.g.*, an eye or an ear, since the head is distinguished in the above extracts from any particular organ. The "Modo Pratico" directs that it be applied to the forehead, "nella fronte".[4] Baruffaldi appears to recommend the same,[5] and so does Falise.[6] It would be well, we think, to follow this in practice. But after applying the thumb to the forehead, we would instantly,

[1] Lib. vi. n. 710. Vid. Baruffaldi, tit. xxvii. n. 125.
[2] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. iii. n. 5.
[3] Loc. cit. [4] Cap. ix.
[5] Tit. xxvii. n. 125.
[6] III^me^ Partie, sect. i. chap. iv. n. 4.

and without making the sign of the cross,[1] pass it over one eye, over the nose and lips, and then apply it to one ear. We should thus have the unction of all the organs, the forehead holding the place of the hand. We are convinced this could be done as quickly as the words of the form above given could be pronounced. In most cases, even the hand, after the ear, could be anointed within the time. The reasons for preferring this mode are given hereafter.[2] If, however, this mode be impossible, on account of the position of the head, or from some other cause, any organ, or, if all else fails, any part of the body that can be reached, may be anointed.[3]

873. In the words above cited, St. Liguori supposes that the unction takes place "sub conditione". Neither Benedict XIV., nor the "Modo Pratico", makes mention of a condition; but they, perhaps, suppose it, as the validity of the sacrament, though highly probable, is not quite certain.[4]

We have nowhere seen the words to be used, if a person chooses to express the condition; but we think it may be accurately expressed thus: "*Si hæc materia sit suffi-*"*ciens: Per istam sanctam*", etc. In all cases of this kind, it is enough that the condition be such as, if actually placed, must remove the existing doubt regarding the validity of the sacrament. When a form of words expressing the condition is prescribed by the rubric, of course it should be used; but where no form is prescribed,

[1] Vid. infra, cap. xvi. § x.
[2] Infra, § xv.
[3] Cleric., *De Ext. Unct.*, Decis. lxvi. n. 8.
[4] Vid. infra, § xv.

[illegible] be expressed in words; it is [illegible] in the mind.[illegible]

[illegible] to be anointed in [illegible] appropriate to each, but [illegible] expressed or mentally [illegible] *facta*"; or one [illegible]

[illegible] Nothing but a case of real necessity can justify the priest in omitting four out of the five unctions, as is clearly laid down in the above extract from Benedict XIV.[4] The case in which it is feared that the person may die before they are completed, is undoubtedly such a case of necessity. But is there any other, it may be asked, in which the priest is justified in applying a single unction in the manner explained? The "Modo Pratico"[5] mentions two others. The first is the case of pestilence. This is commonly admitted by theologians,[6] and seems to be included by St. Liguori in the words above cited, "tempore pestis", which may be taken to mean, "when there is danger of catching the infection", for it cannot be implied that in pestilence there is always danger of death before the unctions can be completed.

The second case is that in which the sacrament is to be administered to a number of sick, and in which there is danger that, if the five unctions are applied to each, there will not be time to administer the sacrament to all.[7]

[1] Gury. ii. n. [illegible] Quær. [illegible]. Vid. supra, chap. iii. § x.

[2] Lacroix. lib. vi. pars. ii. n. 2121.

[3] Modo Pratico, cap. ix.

[4] Supra, n. 871.

[5] Loc. cit.

[6] Vid. Cleric. Decis. lxvi. n. 9. Bened. XIV. *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. xiii. cap. xix. n. 29.

[7] Modo Pratico, l. c.

This case must be of frequent occurrence in time of epidemic, and must, no doubt, be often dealt with by military chaplains in time of war, when they have to administer the last sacraments to a number of wounded men together.

§ XII.—**Si vero dum inungitur, infirmus decedat, Presbyter ultra non procedat, et prædictas Orationes omittat. Quod si dubitet an vivat adhuc, unctionem prosequatur, sub conditione pronuntiando formam dicens: *Si vivis, per istam sanctam Unctionem, etc.*, ut infra.**

875. If the priest be sure that the person is dead before he has completed the unctions, he is to proceed no further: he is not even to supply the prayers that may have been omitted. The whole rite supposes the person to be living, and should therefore cease the instant it is known that he is dead. The priest should in this case read the prayers for a soul just departed, commencing, "*Subvenite* "*Sancti Dei*", etc.[1]

But if he be in doubt, as is usually the case in practice, for it is very difficult to ascertain the exact moment of death, he is to proceed with the unctions, using the conditional form here prescribed, "*Si vivis per istam*", etc. The rubric clearly supposes that the priest is administering the sacrament by anointing the organs in the usual way. But from what has been said above,[2] it may be inferred that as soon as the doubt, whether the person be alive, occurs, he should instantly apply a single unction with the general form, and then proceed with the separate

[1] De Herdt, n. 23, i. 3°.

[2] Supra, n. 871.

unctions, resuming where he left off, and using in condition "*Si vivis*", etc.

§ XIII.—**Si autem acciderit infirmum post p rum suorum Confessionem ad exitum vitæ properar cum sacro Viatico poterit et Oleum Infirmorum deferri per ipsum Sacerdotem qui defert sacram Eu tiam. Si tamen alius Presbyter, vel Diaconus, qui sanctum deferat, haberi possit, per ipsum deferat superpelliceo indutus, cum Oleo sacro occulte dela quatur Sacerdotem Viaticum portantem; et postqu firmus Viaticum sumpserit, inungatur a Sacerdote.**

876. In countries where the Blessed Sacrament ried to the sick in solemn procession, the priest allowed to carry the "oleum infirmorum" along wi unless in the case here mentioned by the rubric, *i.* case in which both the Viaticum and Extreme U must be administered at the same time, while there other priest, nor even a deacon, to carry the holy oil this case, the rubric permits the priest to carry the oil, as well as the Blessed Sacrament, but it does n plain in what manner. De Herdt says the vessel should be fastened round the neck, and carried unde surplice, so as not to appear, because if the rubric d that even another priest, or a deacon carrying it after should carry it secretly, much more should this b quired of the priest himself, who is publicly carrying Blessed Sacrament.[1]

877. But what the rubric regards as exceptional Ireland and other countries similarly circumstanced

[1] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 24. 1.

general rule. On account of the scarcity of priests, and the distance in most cases of the houses of the faithful from the church or parochial residence, the priest, when called on to attend a sick person, usually goes prepared to administer both the Viaticum and Extreme Unction, before he leaves him. He is, moreover, obliged to carry the Blessed Sacrament, as well as the oil, privately.[1]

In case of very urgent necessity, the holy oil might be carried by a laic, according to De Herdt[2] and the continuator of Gardellini.[3] Hence, if a priest attending one that is dying, had not the holy oil with him, he might send a laic to bring it, while he himself is engaged hearing the dying man's confession.[4]

§ XIV.—**In eadem infirmitate hoc Sacramentum iterari non debet, nisi diuturna sit, ut si, cum infirmus convaluerit, iterum in periculum mortis inciderit.**

878. Extreme Unction can be administered only to those who are in danger of death, as we have seen.[5] When once administered, it cannot be repeated *while the same danger continues.* Benedict XIV. mentions some strange opinions which were held on this subject. One of these was, that a person could receive Extreme Unction only once during his life. Another, that it could be received only after an interval of three years from the last. In the opposite extreme, he cites some ancient rituals which prescribed a repetition of the unctions, as

[1] Vid. infra, chap. xvi. § iii.
[2] Loc. cit. n. 20, i.
[3] *Annotat.* in Decr. 16 Dec. 1826. *in Gandaven.*, ad 2 Quæs. v. n. 4623.
[4] Vid. *Annotat.* cit.
[5] Supra, § vi.

well as the administration of the viaticum, every day for seven successive days.[1]

But these opinions and practices were confined to a few. The doctrine commonly received and acted on at all times, is that which is conveyed in the present rubric. It is the doctrine taught by St. Thomas, and after him by all theologians, viz., that in the same sickness, and while the same danger of death continues, the sacrament cannot be administered a second time (according to many, not even validly),[2] but that it may be repeated as often as a person, having recovered from the danger, again falls into it, even during the same sickness.[3]

879. The great difficulty in practice sometimes is, to ascertain when a person during the same illness has so far recovered that it should be again administered in case of relapse. In an illness of very short duration, it is never administered a second time, for in such a case the recovery is either complete, or merely apparent. Hence the rubric says: "**cum diuturna sit**".

880. But a mere continuance of life, no matter how long, does not of itself justify the administration of the sacrament a second time. All theologians seem to be agreed that a recovery of some kind is required. St. Liguori, after citing the words of our rubric, says: "Unde "adverte quod in morbo diuturno, si infirmus post uncti- "onem certe manserit in eodem periculo mortis, non "poterit rursus ungi".[4] Generally speaking, however,

[1] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. viii. n. 3 et 4.
[2] Vid. Lacroix, lib. vi. p. ii. n. 2103.
[3] Benedict XIV., l. c. St. Lig. n. 715.
[4] Loc. cit.

changes for the better do take place in diseases of lengthened duration, as consumption or dropsy. In one of these, a person in manifest danger of death at present, may be over this danger in a few days, and be tolerably well for several weeks or months, although it is known that the disease still continues, and is even likely to end fatally. In such a case, when the disease takes another turn, and the person is again in similar danger, Extreme Unction may be again administered, for, though the disease is the same, the *state* of the disease is different.

We cannot do better than give here the words of St. Thomas on this subject, quoted by Benedict XIV.[1] "Hoc "sacramentum non respicit tantum infirmitatem sed etiam "infirmitatis statum; quia non debet dari nisi infirmis "qui secundum humanam æstimationem videntur morti "appropinquare. Quædam ergo infirmitates non sunt "diuturnæ; unde si in iis datur hoc sacramentum, tunc "cum homo ad illum statum perveniat, quod sit in peri- "culo mortis, non recedit a statu illo, nisi infirmitate curatâ: "et ita iterum non debet inungi; sed si recidivum patia- "tur, erit alia infirmitas, et poterit fieri alia inunctio. "Quædam vero sunt ægritudines diuturnæ, ut hectica et "hydropisis, et hujusmodi; et in talibus non debet fieri "inunctio, nisi quando videntur perducere ad periculum "mortis; et si homo illum articulum evadat, eâdem infir- "mitate durante, et iterum ad similem statum per illam "infirmitatem reducatur, iterum potest inungi; quia jam "est quasi alius infirmitatis status, quamvis non sit alia "infirmitas simpliciter".[2]

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] *In Supplem.*, 3^tae^ partis Quæs. 33. art. ii.

881. To verify the condition of the rubric "si e "luerit", it is not enough that the patient appears t out of danger for a few days. There must be prob ground for believing that he has really got out of da and there must therefore be an improvement that conti for a considerable time.[1]

It is the practice of some in all cases of tedious ill to repeat Extreme Unction after the interval of a m It would be hard to reconcile this practice with the ru and the words of St. Liguori above cited,[2] when it is tain that the same danger has continued all the time. it often happens that, all things considered, there is a d whether the state of the disease has really change whether the danger has at any time ceased, or has all a continued; and in this case of doubt the priest is rec mended to administer the sacrament again, as more accordance with the ancient practice of the Church.[3] N it may be contended that there is, generally speaki ground for such a doubt in the case of any one who li a month after receiving Extreme Unction, and is still danger of death; and that therefore in a tedious illness sacrament should, as a general rule, be repeated after lapse of a month.

882. If one has received Extreme Unction without necessary dispositions, and therefore without fruit, thou validly, the sacrament cannot on this account be repeat during the same danger. But theologians commor teach that in such circumstances the sacrament wo revive and produce its effect, as soon as the requisite d

[1] St. Lig., l. c. in fine.
[2] Supra, n. 880.
[3] Bened. XIV., l. c. St. Lig., l. c.

positions are present.[1] If the want of these dispositions at the time was not culpable, and if no mortal sin has been committed in the mean time, attrition would suffice for the reviviscence: otherwise perfect contrition or the sacrament of penance would be necessary, just as in the case of the reviviscence of baptism.[2]

883. Should one who has received Extreme Unction with the proper dispositions, fall into grievous sin while the same danger still continues, he would lose from that moment the right to those special helps that are the effect of the sacrament; but that right would be restored to him along with sanctifying grace on his making an act of perfect contrition, or receiving sacramental absolution.[3]

§ XV.—**Quinque vero corporis partes præcipue ungi debent, quas veluti sensuum instrumenta homini natura tribuit, nempe oculi, aures, nares, os et manus: attamen pedes etiam et renes ungendi sunt; sed renum unctio in mulieribus, honestatis gratia, semper omittitur; atque etiam in viris quando infirmus commode moveri non potest. Sed sive in mulieribus sive in viris, alia corporis pars pro renibus ungi non debet.**

884. "The sacred unction", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "is to be applied not to the entire body, "but to the organs of sense only: to the eyes because the "organs of sight; to the ears because the organs of hear-"ing; to the nostrils because the organs of smelling; to "the mouth because the organ of taste and speech; to "the hands because the organs of touch. True, the sense

[1] St. Lig., n. 707. Quær. ii. [2] Vid. supra, n. 449.
[3] Vid. De Lugo, *De Sac. Pœnit.*, Disp. xi. sect. iii. n. 49.

"of touch is diffused alike throughout the body, but th
"hands are its principal seat. This manner of administe
"ing Extreme Unction is observed throughout the un
"versal Church, and admirably accords with the medic
"nal nature of this sacrament. As in corporal infirmit
"although it affects the entire body, the cure is applied
"that part only which is the source and origin of th
"disease; so is this sacrament applied not to the enti
"body, but to those members which are preëminently th
"organs of sense, and also to the loins, which are, as
"were, the seat of concupiscence, and to the feet, by whic
"we move from one place to another".[1]

885. It is certain that the unction of the feet as well a that of the loins may be omitted, without affecting th validity of the sacrament. It is also certain that when th organ is double, it is enough for the validity to anoint one as, *e.g.* one eye for the sense of sight. Nor is it necessar to the validity to observe the order of the parts anointed.

886. But theologians are not agreed whether or no th unction simply of the five organs of sense be necessary The more common opinion, according to St. Liguori, affirms that it is, and since there is here question of th validity of the sacrament, this opinion, as the safer, mus be followed in practice.[4] It is probable, however, that single unction suffices, and we have already seen how thi opinion is to be acted on in case of necessity.[5]

887. The several opinions that are or might be hel

[1] Pars. ii. cap. vi. n. 10.
[2] St. Lig., n. 710, *Certum est.*
[3] Loc. cit. *Secunda sententia.*
[4] Vid. St. Lig., lib. i. n. 48.
[5] Supra, n. 872.

on this subject, are expressed in the following propositions:—

1° The unction of the five organs of sense, with the form appropriate to each, is essential.

2° The unction of the five organs with one general form, expressing all the senses, is sufficient.

3° The unction of the forehead for all the organs with the general form is sufficient.

4° The unction of one organ with the general form is sufficient.

5° The unction of any part of the body with the general form is sufficient.

6° The unction of one organ of sense with the form appropriate to that sense is sufficient.

Now those who maintain that the unction of the five organs of sense is necessary, may hold either the first or the second of these opinions; and from the way in which some authors speak on the subject, it is difficult to determine which of the two they do hold. Generally speaking, they seem to hold the first. At all events the first opinion is the one which St. Liguori says is "commu-"nior et tutior".[1] It is manifestly the "tutior", and since there is here question of the validity of the sacrament, this is the opinion which must be followed in practice, unless when necessity may require one to act on some of the others.[2]

888. The second opinion appears to be somewhat more probable than any of those which follow. It is sustained by all that can be alleged in favour of any of them, and has besides the advantage of approximating more to the

[1] Loc. cit. n. 710.

[2] Vid. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 57.

first, for, in it, there is really the unction of the five organs and the sole doubt is regarding the sufficiency of the form. Hence in case of necessity several theologians recommend the priest to follow it if he can.[1] Suarez, after explaining this opinion, says: "Hanc sententiam hoc modo explicatam "improbare non possum", and seemingly would allow it and no other to be acted on, when the unctions cannot be applied in the usual way.[2] Coninck appears to adopt the same view, and, since his authority is referred to approvingly by Benedict XIV.,[3] we give his words. After stating that, in case of necessity, the Pastoral of Mechlin directs a single unction to be applied with the general form (which is the form above cited from St. Liguori), he proceeds: "Securius tamen esset in dicto casu ungere celeri "ter quinque organa sensuum in capite, pronuntiando for "mam ibi præscriptam, quod videtur ferè æque celeriter "posse fieri; et tunc ipsæ unctiones responderent ipsi for "mæ, quâ videtur significari omnium sensuum organa "inungi".[4]

889. It is hard to say that the third opinion is more probable than the fourth, while the fourth cannot be said to differ in reality from the fifth, since the sense of touch is "diffused alike throughout the body", as stated by the Catechism of the Council of Trent in the extract given above.[5]

Those who prefer the unction of the head to the unction of any particular organ, do not express this preference in a very decided way. They merely say, it is more advis-

[1] Busembaum, qui citat Laym. et Diana, apud St. Lig., n. 710.
[2] Disp. xli. sect. iii. n. 8. in fine.
[3] Supra, n. 871.
[4] *De Extrema Unctione*, Disp. xix. Dub. iii. n. 12.
[5] Supra, n. 884.

able. "Consultius" is the word used by Benedict XIV. and St. Liguori,[1] and this word certainly does not convey the idea of notably greater security. At the same time the reason assigned for the preference seems to be its greater security, inasmuch as the unction of the head, in which all the organs of sense are united by the nerves, is a better substitute for the unction of all the organs, than the unction of any one could be.[2]

890. It is highly probable that either one or other is sufficient for the validity; nay more, that the unction of any part of the body with the general form, as asserted in the fifth opinion, is quite sufficient. Benedict XIV., after citing a great many authorities in favour of this view, observes that it is powerfully sustained by the variety of usage in different parts of the Church, both as to the number of unctions and the particular parts anointed; and still more by the authority of the many rituals which expressly permit the use of a single unction with the general form, when all the unctions cannot be applied.[3]

891. We do not know that the sixth opinion is held by any one, although it might, perhaps, be deduced from opinions that are held.[4] One great objection to it is, that, if it be true, it would follow that in the ordinary manner of anointing, a complete sacrament is conferred in every unction, which, we think, would not be admitted by any one.

So much for the speculative question. In practice we have already seen what is to be done in case of necessity;[5]

[1] Vid. supra, n. 871. [2] Bened. XIV., cit. supra, n. 871.
[3] *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. iii. n. 3 et 4.
[4] Vid. infra, § xix. [5] Supra, n. 872.

but in ordinary cases the unctions are to be applied as directed in the present rubric, and more fully explained hereafter.[1]

892. The usage regarding the parts anointed has not been invariable. In the Greek Church at present the unction is applied to the forehead, chin, and both cheeks (thus forming a cross in the unction of the head), then to the breast, to the two hands, and the two feet.[2] But in the commencement of the ninth century only three unctions, it is said, were in use in the Eastern Church.[3]

In the Western Church the custom of anointing the five organs of sense appears to have prevailed everywhere and from the earliest times; but there was a great diversity of usage, and there still is considerable diversity in different places, as to the parts anointed *in addition to these*. In several ancient rituals the unction of one or more of the following parts is prescribed—in some, of one part, in others, of another—the neck, the throat, the breast, the loins, the knees, the calves, the feet, between the shoulders, the navel, the place of greatest pain.[4]

In many rituals used in Belgium the unction of the breast is prescribed, but that of the loins is omitted.[5] The same is also true of many rituals used in France.[6]

893. In the ritual published for the use of the clergy in England,[7] the unction of the loins is not mentioned

[1] Chap. xvi.

[2] Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. vii. art. iii. n. viii.

[3] Martene, ibid.

[4] Martene, l. c. et art. iv. per totum. Cfr. Benedict XIV. l. c. n. 3.

[5] De Herdt, par. vi. n. 21. iii. et iv.

[6] Dictionnaire des Rites Sacrés, art. *Ext. Unct.: Resumè d'un grand nombre de Rituels*, par Beuvelet. [7] Richardson, Derby, MDCCCLVI.

but the other unctions are prescribed, as in the Roman ritual. In the "Excerpta ex Rituali", etc., for the use of the clergy of the United States of America,[1] it is observed in a note, that the usage throughout the States is, always to omit the unction of the loins.

Wherever the Roman Ritual is ordered to be observed, as it is in Ireland,[2] the unction of the loins is not to be omitted in men, unless in the case here excepted by the rubric itself, but in no case is it permitted to anoint another part (*e.g.*, the breast) instead of the loins, that is, as we take it, with the form . . . . "*quicquid per* "*lumborum delectationem deliquisti*". Nor is it permitted to add these words while anointing another part, *e.g.* to use, while anointing the feet, the form, . . . "*quic-* "*quid per gressum et lumborum delectationem deliquisti*". The present rubric clearly forbids any substitution for the unction of the loins, and will have it simply omitted when it cannot be properly applied, although when any of the other parts mentioned cannot be anointed, the unction may be applied to the part nearest, according to what is directed below.[3]

§ XVI.—**Manus vero, quæ reliquis infirmis interius ungi debent, Presbyteris exterius ungantur.**

894. Two reasons are assigned for this provision of the rubric, but they are reasons of mere congruity; the validity of the sacrament is nowise involved. One is, that the priest's hands are anointed on the palms at his ordination: another, that the priest, if he still retains his

[1] Baltimori, 1860.

[2] Syn. Thurl., *De Ext. Unct.*, n. 51.

[3] Infra, § xviii.

consciousness, may be thus reminded of his dignity, and excited to compunction for the sins of which his hands, though consecrated, may have been the instruments.[1]

The distinction here made between priests and others is mentioned by very few of the ancient rituals given by Martene,[2] and by none of them earlier than the twelfth century. Some of them are silent about the part of the hand to be anointed, while many of them expressly direct that the exterior be anointed, without any distinction of persons. But the ritual of Fleury, in the twelfth century, at the unction of the hands, has the rubric, "*Si fuerit sacerdos solummodo deforis*",[3] and from that date we find the practice here fixed by the Roman ritual, commonly established.

§ XVII.—**Dum oculos, aures, et alia corporis membra, quæ paria sunt, Sacerdos ungit, caveat, ne alterum ipsorum inungendo, Sacramenti formam prius absolvat, quam ambo hujusmodi paria membra perunxerit.**

895. The right eye or ear, etc., is always anointed first. What is here prescribed is required, not for the validity of the sacrament, as may be inferred from what has been said elsewhere,[4] but merely for the exact and decorous performance of the ceremony. The precise distribution of the words is not fixed, but we believe it is the usual practice to anoint, *e.g.*, the right eye while pronouncing the words "*Per istam sanctam unctionem*", and then the left, while pronouncing the remaining words of the form, "*et suam piissimam*", etc.

[1] Baruff., n. 113. De Herdt, l. c. iv.
[2] Loc. cit. art. iv.
[3] Martene, l. c. Ord. xxiv.
[4] Supra, n. 134 et n. 385.

§ XVIII.—**Si quis autem sit aliquo membro mutilatus, pars loco illi proxima inungatur, eadem verborum forma.**

896. If one has lost a member, the part nearest to it is to be anointed as here directed. If it be a member of which he once had the use, it is easy to understand how the words of the form can be verified. But the unction is to be applied, although he may have wanted the member or its use from his birth, *e.g.*, the eyes of one who has been born blind are to be anointed with the usual form, "*quicquid per visum deliquisti*". Theologians explain this, with St. Thomas, by saying that, though the person has been, of course, incapable of sinning like others by the external organs, he may have sinned by analogous internal desires, or by those internal powers or faculties which correspond to, and are immediately exercised through, the external organs.[1]

Should the person have redundant members, *e.g.*, a third hand, then those are to be anointed that have been most in use, or that are nearest to the natural position.[2]

§ XIX.—**Hujus autem Sacramenti forma, qua Sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur, solemnis illa precatio est, quam Sacerdos ad singulas unctiones adhibet, cum ait:** *Per istam sanctam Unctiónem, et suam piíssimam misericórdiam, indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid per visum, sive per audítum, etc., deliquísti.*

897. "The form of the sacrament", says the Cate-

[1] St. Lig., 732 in fine. Baruff., tit. xxvii. n. 120.
[2] Baruff., n. 119. De Herdt, pars. vi, n. 21. iii. 7°,

chism of the Council of Trent, "is the word and that "solemn prayer used by the priest at each anointing: "'*Per istam sanctam unctionem*', etc. That such is the "true and proper form of this sacrament, the Apostle "St. James intimates, when he says: 'et orent super eum "'et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum'; words from which "we may infer, that the form is to be pronounced by "way of prayer, although the Apostle does not say of "what particular words that prayer is to consist; but this "has reached us by the faithful tradition of the Fathers, "so that all the churches retain that form observed by "the holy Church of Rome, the mother and mistress of "all churches. Some, it is true, alter a few words, as "when for '*Indulgeat tibi Deus*', they say, '*Remittat*', or "'*Parcat*', and sometimes, '*Sanet quicquid commisisti*'; "but, as the sense is the same, it is clear that the same "form is religiously observed by all".[1]

It is certain, therefore, that the priest is bound to use the deprecative form, which is the only one used at present in the Eastern, as well as in the Western Church. Many theologians maintain with St. Thomas,[2] that it is essential to the validity of the sacrament, and that the indicative form would not suffice. This they infer from the words of St. James, using the argument just given by the Catechism of the Council.[3]

898. Others, however, maintain[4] that the indicative form is valid, and they give one argument which appears

[1] Pars. ii. cap. vi. n. 6.
[2] 3 par. *Sum. Theol. Supplem.*, Q. xxix. art. viii.
[3] St. Lig., n. 711. Dub. i. Suarez, Disp. xl. sec. iii. n. 7.
[4] Apud. St. Lig., l. c.

to be very strong, viz., that in many of the ancient rituals, the form is indicative—"*Ungo te*", etc.—as may be seen in those given by Martene.[1] Many of them, no doubt, may be interpreted in a deprecative sense, as, *e.g.* that of Cambray, which has "*Ungo oculos tuos de oleo* "*sanctificato* UT *quicquid illicito visu deliquisti hujus olei* "*unctione expietur, per*", etc, and so of the other senses.[2] The particle "*ut*" may be understood to give a deprecative sense to this and other similar forms in which it occurs. But there are some ancient forms, as that of Narbonne,[3] in which no word occurs to insinuate a deprecative sense, and which do not admit of it without violence, as is observed by Benedict XIV.[4] It cannot be denied, then, that the opinion of those who maintain the validity of the indicative form is probable, but of course it can never be used in practice.[5]

899. The form here given is that prescribed by the decree of Eugene IV.[6] The priest must be careful to pronounce it according to the instructions of the ritual, otherwise he is certainly guilty of sin.[7] But the variety of the ancient forms is such, that it is difficult to determine what words are essential, or what could be omitted without affecting the validity. It is certain that the form of this sacrament has not been determined by Christ, *in specie infimâ*, that is to say, the words have not been

[1] Lib. i. cap. vii. art. iv. [2] Martene, l. c. ordo, xix.
[3] Ordo, xiii.
[4] *De Synod Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. ii. in fine.
[5] St. Lig., lib. i. n. 48.
[6] *Pro Armenis*, apud Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, etc., n. 595.
[7] St. Lig., n. 711.

fixed by Him like those in the forms of Baptism and the Eucharist. "Formam sacramenti extremæ unctionis", says Benedict XIV., "non esse a Christo Domino institu-"tam *in specie infima*, ut aiunt, hoc est, certis verbis "præscriptam, theologi omnes admittunt, atque ex diver-"sis formulis etiam in Ecclesia Latina in illius administra-"tione usurpatis evidenter demonstratur".[1]

900. It is agreed that the word "*sanctam*" is not essential; and it is most probable that the words, "*et* "*suam piissimam misericordiam*" are not essential.[2] Hence the form expressed thus would be valid: "*Per istam* "*unctionem indulgeat tibi Dominus quicquid deliquisti* "*per visum, auditum*", etc. It is commonly admitted that the word "*deliquisti*" or some other of the same import is essential.[3] But it is not equally certain that the expression of the senses is essential. We have seen that when, in case of necessity, a single form is used, it should contain an expression of each sense after the word "*deliquisti*",[4] but many are of opinion that it suffices for the validity to express them in general, ... "*quicquid deli-*"*quisti per sensus*".[5]

Some go still further, and contend that it is not necessary to express the senses at all, and that the words, "*Indulgeat tibi Deus*", alone are essential; for the act of anointing, they say, precludes the necessity of using the words "*per istam unctionem*", while the word "*indul-*"*geat*" sufficiently implies "*quicquid deliquisti*".[6] To

[1] *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. ii.
[2] St. Lig., n. 711. [3] St. Lig., ibid. [4] Supra, n. 871.
[5] Vid. Collet, *De Extrema Unctione*, cap. iv. Quær. i.
[6] Juenin, apud Catal., tit. v. cap. i. § xix. n. ix.

this opinion it may be objected that from it, especially if combined with that which asserts the sufficiency of a single unction, the conclusion seems to follow that, in the ordinary administration, the sacrament is conferred not once, but six or seven times. It may be answered, however, that the words "*per visum*", "*per auditum*", etc., restrict and determine the meaning of the form, so as to make the unction of each sense only a part of the sacrament, for even the addition of a word to those that are essential, can affect the meaning of a sacramental form.[1]

901. It is disputed amongst theologians whether a distinct grace is produced by each unction, or the whole grace is conferred only when the last unction with its form is completed.[2] Some maintain the former opinion, and illustrate it by the example of "Orders", which though only one sacrament, contains under it several partial sacraments, each with its own matter and form; and by the example of the Eucharist, in which a distinct grace is perhaps received by the reception of each species or even, in many cases, of each of several particles successively, although "the sacrament" is received only once at a single refection. Suarez says this opinion is probable, but he himself holds the latter, which is the opinion of St. Thomas. He explains the last unction to be, not the last which may be actually conferred, but the unction of the last of the five organs of sense.[3] St. Liguori[4] seems to regard the two opinions as equally probable.

[1] Vid. De Lugo, *De Sacramentis*, Disp. ii. sect. vi. n. 127.
[2] St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 707.
[3] Vid. Disp. xli. sec. ii.
[4] Loc. cit.

CHAPTER XVI.

ORDER OF ADMINISTERING THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

ORDO MINISTRANDI SACRAMENTUM EXTREMÆ UNCTIONIS.

§ I.—Sacerdos igitur Sacramentum ministraturus, quatenus fieri poterit, parari curet apud infirmum mensam mappa candida coopertam; itemque vas, in quo sit bombacium, seu quid simile in septem globulos distinctum, ad abstergendas partes inunctas; medullam panis ad detergendos digitos, et aquam ad abluendas Sacerdotis manus; ceream item candelam, quæ deinde accensa ipsi ungenti lumen præbeat. Denique operam dabit ut quanta poterit munditia ac nitore hoc Sacramentum ministretur.

902. The Council of Trent has defined that a priest alone is the minister of Extreme Unction, and that the "Presbyteri Ecclesiæ" mentioned by St. James[1] are not the elders in each community, as the heretics maintain, but priests ordained by a bishop.[2] This interpretation was never doubted in antiquity. The very name given to them, "Presbyteri Ecclesiæ", the function assigned to them, and the effects attributed to their ministry by the Apostle, show clearly that he did not mean simply persons advanced in years.[3]

[1] Cap. v. 14. [2] Sess. xiv. *De Sac. Extr. Unct.*, can. iv.
[3] Vide Estium, in loc.

903. Any priest can confer the sacrament validly, but its administration is reserved to the ordinary pastor. Another who would confer it without his leave, expressed or implied, or at least reasonably presumed, would be guilty of grievous sin.[1] A religious incurs excommunication if he administers it, without this leave, to any except members of his community or others to whom he may be privileged to administer it.[2] But in case of necessity it may be administered by any priest, at least by any priest who is not excommunicated.[3]

904. A table should be prepared in the chamber of the sick person in the manner already directed for the case in which the Viaticum is about to be administered.[4] The same that has been prepared for the Viaticum serves also for Extreme Unction, which is so often administered immediately after.[5] There should be placed on it, besides the crucifix and candles, a plate containing cotton or flax, divided into seven, or, for a female, six little balls or pellets, to be used in wiping the parts anointed, and also some crumbs of bread, or a little dry meal, with a basin of water for the priest's hands. Should the table be prepared for Extreme Unction alone, it suffices to have one wax candle, to be lighted and held by a clerk, when the priest is anointing. If it be prepared for the Viaticum, two candles are lighted from the commencement, and one of these may be held at the proper time by the minister. Out of reverence for the sacrament, it is

[1] St. Lig., n. 722. [2] St. Lig., l. c.

[3] St. Lig., n. 723. Vid. Bened. XIV., *De Synod. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. iv. n. 7.

[4] Vid. supra, n. 792. [5] De Herdt, n. 24, i. 3°.

recommended also, that the parts to be anointed be washed immediately before the priest comes.[1]

905. The last clause of this rubric shows the object of the Church in all these preliminary arrangements. It is that thus due regard may be had to cleanliness and propriety, and that the whole ceremony may be performed in a manner to conciliate the respect and veneration of the faithful. The rubric says "**quatenus fieri poterit, parari "curet**" .... "**operam dabit**". It does not then require the priest himself to do those things. It simply requires him to do what he can, in the circumstances in which he may find himself, to have these preparations made. In giving instructions to the people regarding this sacrament, he may very easily take occasion to tell them, how the chamber of the sick person should be prepared for the visit of the priest when he is sent for.

There is no cabin so poor that it may not be made clean, at least around the bed of the sick; none in which a table with a clean white cover may not be prepared, at least by borrowing from some charitable neighbour. There might be some pious confraternity, the members of which would undertake to have the necessary preparations made.[2] There would be rarely wanting at least some pious person in the townland or district, who would see to the arrangement of everything as prescribed by the rubric, were the priest only to suggest this, and to show what is to be done. The only expensive requisite is the wax candle. Even this costs very little, and would be supplied, we have no doubt, by the charity of others to the few who might be unable themselves to procure it.

[1] De Herdt, n. 21. ii.

[2] Vid. supra, n. 795.

The same candles could be taken from house to house, as they might be required, until consumed; and, if necessary, they could be purchased by the priest himself, and some given to one in each district, who would be charitable enough to take charge of them for the purpose. In this way, we believe, a few shillings annually would suffice to supply the poor of an entire parish.

Of course there are cases so urgent as to leave no time for preparation, but in ordinary cases there is rarely a sufficient reason for not complying with what the rubric prescribes.

§ II.—**Deinde convocatis Clericis seu ministris, vel saltem uno Clerico qui Crucem sine hasta, Aquam benedictam cum aspersorio, et librum Ritualem deferat, ipse Parochus decenter accipit vas sacri Olei infirmorum, sacculo serico violacei coloris inclusum, illudque caute deferat, ne effundi possit.**

906. For many centuries this sacrament was usually administered by a number of priests together. This practice is still continued in the Greek Church, and it prevailed in the Latin Church down to the thirteenth century, although from the earliest times instances are recorded of its being administered by a single priest, and no doubt was entertained of its validity when thus conferred. All this is stated by Benedict XIV.,[1] and is very clearly shown by Martene.[2] According to the Greek Euchologium, the number of priests should be seven; but

[1] *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. viii. cap. iv. n. 5.

[2] *De Rit. Ant. Eccl.*, lib. i. cap. vii. art. iii. n. ii., iii., et v.

all admit that, in case of necessity, it may be administered by three.[1]

907. The Greeks insist on a plurality of ministers on account of the words of St. James: . . . "inducat presbyteros"; but this expression of the Apostle is fairly interpreted to signify, "one of the priests"; at least it cannot be shown that in strictness it requires the presence of more than one.[2] The Greeks who are united to the Church are allowed to retain their usage, but they are required to acknowledge that the sacrament can be validly conferred by a single priest.[3]

According to the Greek usage the ceremony is very long. The priests bless the oil with several prayers and canticles; they recite seven epistles, seven gospels, and seven long prayers. Each of them anoints the sick person, reciting, while he anoints, the prayer Πατερ Ἅγιε ἰατρὲ τῶν ψυχῶν και τῶν σωμάτων, etc. This prayer, according to the common opinion, constitutes the form of the sacrament.[4] The book of the gospels is placed on the sick man's head, and all the priests impose hands on him while the principal priest, called in the rubric ὁ προϊστάμενος, recites a prayer. We may observe that the oil is blessed each time, and the ceremony is performed in the church, if the sick person can be brought to it, otherwise in his house.

The extract given by Martene[5] is an exact translation

[1] Benedict XIV., l. c. n. 8. Martene, l. c.

[2] Vid. Cornelium A Lapide, in loc. Suarez, Disp. xliii. sect. ii. n. 1.

[3] Benedict XIV. loc. cit.

[4] Sylvester, *Compendium Theologiæ Classicum pro Græcis*, cap. lxiii. § 5. Collet, *De Ext. Unct.*, cap. iv. concl. ii.

[5] Art. iv. ordo xxxiii.

of the Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ἁγιου Ἐλαίου, given in the ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΜΕΓΑ used at present in the Greek Church. The rubric regarding the unctions is not very clear. It simply says that the priest anoints, saying the prayer "*Pater Sancte*", etc. . . . and then, that this same prayer is said by each priest while he anoints. All the parts, however, are anointed by each priest, not one by one priest, and another by another.

908. Although, as has been said, the same usage as to a plurality of priests prevailed in the Western Church, there was a diversity of practice, according to Martene, as to the part taken by each priest in the administration. Sometimes each priest anointed all the parts with the appropriate forms; sometimes one anointed one part, and another another, with the form appropriate to each; and some instances are mentioned in which it would seem that one applied the unctions while another pronounced the form.[1] This last mode is most probably invalid, but the others are undoubtedly valid.[2] Benedict XIV. says there can be no doubt of the validity of the sacrament when the organs of sense are anointed by different priests, each pronouncing the form appropriate to that which he anoints.[3]

909. According to the present usage, the unctions are applied by a single priest, and it is not lawful to depart from this usage, at least if we except the case of necessity,[4] and we doubt if it would be expedient even then, for the case of necessity is otherwise provided for.[5]

[1] Art. iii. n. iv.
[2] Suarez, Disp. xliii. sect. ii.
[3] Lib. viii. cap. iv. n. 5.
[4] St. Lig., n. 724 in parenth.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 781.

But should the priest be prevented by a sudden attack, or by any accident, from completing the unctions, another should supply what has been omitted. The second priest in this case should not repeat the unctions performed by the first, but commence where he left off, unless there be a notable delay. If there be a delay of even a quarter of an hour, he should repeat the previous unctions "sub conditione".[1]

910. It is not only permitted, however, but even recommended, that the priest who administers the sacrament be assisted by other priests when they can be easily had, who may act as his ministers in the ceremonies, and join in the prayers.[2] Hence, St. Charles directed that he should have with him as many priests and clerics as he conveniently can.[3] According to our present rubric, the parish priest, when about to administer the sacrament, convenes them, or a few of them (supposing, of course, that there is a sufficient number attached to the parish church), or at least gets one to accompany him and carry the cross, etc., as here prescribed, while he himself carries the holy oil from the church. It is unnecessary to bring the holy water if it be certain that there is some already in the chamber of the sick person.[4] A procession may be formed, but the cross is carried "**sine hasta**", that is, without the long staff or pole on which it is usually fixed in processions; and this, according to Baruffaldi,[5] very probably for the convenience of passing through doors,

[1] St. Lig., n. 724 in parenth. [2] Benedict, XIV. l. c.

[3] *Act. Eccl. Mediol.*, pars. iv. Inst. Ext. Unct. § *De diligentia in Ministrando*, pag. 450.

[4] Vid. Supra, n. 804. [5] Tit. xxviii. n. 32.

ascending stairs, etc., to reach the chamber of the sick. A decree of the Sacred Congregation[1] appears to prohibit the carrying of lights in this procession, though, according to Baruffaldi, they may be carried.[2] It is certain, however, that the bell is not to be rung, lest the faithful might think that the priest is carrying the Viaticum, and kneel down to adore.[3] Hence the rubric[4] expressly prohibits the ringing of the bell.

911. This, however, regards countries where there is nothing to prevent such processions. With us the priest usually has the oil of Extreme Unction in his house,[5] and carries it unattended by any one when he is going to administer the sacrament. He should always bring with him a small crucifix and a little holy water, unless he has reason to believe that he will find both before him in the sick chamber. If he cannot otherwise have a supply of holy water, he should bless some in the house before the commencement of the ceremony, or at least before he takes his leave.[6]

912. The vessel containing the "Oleum Infirmorum" should be apart from those which contain the oils used in Baptism. The necessity which justifies the priest in keeping the "Oleum Infirmorum" in his house does not justify him in keeping the others also in his house, still less in carrying them along with it whenever he goes to administer Extreme Unction.[7]

The oil should be absorbed in a little cotton, as is

[1] 28 Jan. 1606, *in Baren*, n. 289.
[2] Tit. xxviii. n. 29.
[3] Baruff., n. 40, 41.
[4] Infra, § iii.
[5] Supra, n. 856.
[6] Vid. Baruff., n. 94.
[7] Vid. supra, n. 267.

directed by a previous rubric,[1] and the silver vessel containing it should be put into a case made of silk (or, better perhaps, made of leather lined with silk) of a violet colour. It would be well also to have always in the case a little loose cotton, lest on any occasion none might be found where he has to administer the sacrament.

§ III.—**Quod si longius iter peragendum, aut etiam equitandum sit, vel alias adsit periculum effusionis, vas Olei sacculo aut bursa inclusum, ut dictum est, ad collum appendat, ut commodius et securius perferat. Procedat autem sine sonitu campanulæ.**

913. The case contemplated in this rubric is of ordinary occurrence in these countries, and the precautions here recommended should be carefully attended to. We have already seen how the pyxis containing the Blessed Sacrament is to be carried in these circumstances.[2] And since the holy oil is usually carried at the same time, we think the case or cover may be fastened to the same chain or guard round the neck by which the pyxis is secured. For this it is not necessary that it be carried in the same inside pocket with the pyxis; it may be in a different one. A second ring or a second spring-hook would suffice for the purpose. Both would thus be carried with great security, and, as nearly as the circumstances allow, in accordance with what is prescribed in the rubric. The reason for proceeding without sound of bell has been already noticed.[3]

[1] Chap. XV. § V.
[2] Supra, n. 807.
[3] Supra, n. 909 in fine.

§ IV.—**Cum perventum fuerit ad locum ubi jacet infirmus, Sacerdos intrans cubiculum dicit:** *Pax huic domui.* ℟. *Et omnibus, etc.*

914. The salutation here mentioned is pronounced by the priest also before administering the Viaticum.[1] The rubric supposes that the sick person has received the Viaticum some time previously, and that the priest now comes to administer Extreme Unction alone. In this case, entering the chamber he is to say again, *Pax huic*, etc., as here directed. But if he administers Extreme Unction immediately after the Viaticum, he need not repeat it.[2] According to the words of the rubric he is to say it "**Intrans cubiculum**". But if he has said it "**Ingrediens locum ubi jacet infirmus**", as directed by the rubric just before administering the Viaticum,[3] and has not since left the chamber or place where the sick person is, it is evident that he has done all that the present rubric requires.

§ V.—**Deinde deposito Oleo super mensam, superpelliceo stolaque violacea indutus, aegroto Crucem pie deosculandam porrigit; mox in modum crucis eum aqua benedicta, et cubiculum et circumstantes aspergit, dicens Antiphonam:** *Asperges me Domine, etc.*

915. Having entered the sick chamber, he places the Holy Oil on the table prepared as already stated, and then vests in surplice and violet stole. The rubric here supposes the priest to come for the purpose of administering

[1] Supra, n. **908.**
[2] De Herdt, n. 24. i. 4°.
[3] Supra, chap. xiv. § xv.

Extreme Unction alone: for if he has but just s
tered the Viaticum, he is already vested in surpl
requires only to lay aside the white stole, and
violet one.

St. Liguori discusses the question whether th
would be guilty of grievous sin, by administer
sacrament without the surplice and stole; and he sa
"*non urgeat necessitas, certum est graviter peccar*
cites Suarez and others who would not even except
of necessity, on account of the reverence due to th
ment, which should, they say, be preferred to the
tage of the individual.[2] Bouvier maintains th
opinion, and says it should be followed in practic
there be a dispensation, as there is, according to
England, where it may be administered without
plice and stole.[3] St. Liguori, however, incline
opinion which would except the case of necessity

It is to be observed that the case of necessity h
sidered, is the case in which the sick person is ot
in danger of dying without Extreme Unction,
case in which Extreme Unction might be itself ne
as when he could receive no other sacrament,[5] for
a case, we believe, no author would hold that it co
be administered without the sacred vestments.

916. It is, then, the general law of the Church
priest, in administering this sacrament, be vested
plice and stole; and nothing but *bona fide* necess
excuse him from complying with this law. Such
sity existed in these countries during the operation

[1] Lib. vi. n. 726. [2] St. Lig., l. c. [3] *De Ext. Unct.*, cap. v
[4] Loc. cit. [5] Vid. supra, n. **851.**

penal code, when the priest could administer the sacraments only by stealth. But this necessity exists no longer. There is nothing now, generally speaking, to prevent him from complying with what the rubric requires. We say, *generally speaking*, for it may be useful here to discuss the question how far the inconvenience of bringing a soutane and surplice with him to sick calls, may justify the priest in dispensing with them. We have no doubt it is often so great as to justify him. But we do not think it is always, or even generally so.

917. In the first place, the surplice used on these occasions, may be such as can be put into very small bulk, and easily carried. Then, it may be very often given to be carried by the messenger who comes for the priest, and who usually returns immediately to the house of the sick person.

There is a greater difficulty about the cassock or soutane over which the surplice is worn, for it should not be worn over a secular coat. The rubric makes no mention of the soutane, simply because it supposes that this is the ordinary dress of the priest, and it makes no provision for the case in which the priest, as in these countries, can wear out of doors no other than a secular coat, or, at all events, a coat with short skirts. We have not seen the case discussed in any author, nor are we aware of any decision regarding it by a diocesan or provincial synod. To determine the obligation of the priest, then, we must have recourse to general principles.

Now it cannot, we think, be doubted, that the priest is bound to wear the soutane, or what is called the "vestis talaris" in the canons, in the performance of every

sacred function, *if he can do so without notable inconvenience*. From this principle we infer that, even in these countries, the priest is bound to wear the soutane when he administers a sacrament, or performs any religious ceremony *in the church*, for there is no law of the state, no danger of insult, nor any other like reason, to prevent his wearing it while there. If his house be near the church, there is usually nothing to prevent him, if he chooses, from wearing it while passing from the one to the other; but at least he may easily have a soutane in the sacristy which he can put on after going there.

He is bound to wear it also when he administers a sacrament outside the church, provided he can, without inconvenience, bring or send a soutane to the place where he is required to administer it. No doubt, the inconvenience of bringing it is, as we have said, often so great as to justify the priest in dispensing with it. But surely it is not always so. For example, there can be no great inconvenience, if he goes to the place on a car or other vehicle, or if he is accompanied by the messenger who came for him.

If he has to go a considerable distance alone, whether on foot or on horseback, he could not easily bring his soutane with him, but even in such circumstances a great deal might still, we think, be done to carry out the spirit, if not to comply with the letter of the rubric. The soutane, for instance, might be of very light material, made without sleeves, and so as to fit easily over the ordinary coat: it could thus be carried without much inconvenience along with the surplice, both being, as we suppose, compressible into very small bulk.

918. We saw before[1] that the Sacred Congregation, being asked whether the practice existing in some places of giving the Viaticum without the surplice, but with a stole alone, could be permitted—answered: "Negative et "eliminata consuetudine servetur Ritualis Romani præ- "scriptum". On the same occasion, and under the very same head, it was further asked, 2°: "An saltem sacra- "mentum Extremæ Unctionis cum stolâ tantum adminis- "trari potest?" and the answer was: "Negative ut ad "proximum".[2] The continuator of Gardellini, in his note on this decree, would not admit that even a long or difficult journey is a sufficient reason for dispensing with the vestments required by the rubric; he excepts only the case of positive necessity.

In all that we say, however, regarding the obligation of this rubric, and the possibility of complying with it more frequently than is usual in these countries, we would not, and we trust we shall not, be understood as imply- ing a censure on any priest who conforms to existing customs, as long as these are not abolished by the proper authority.[3]

919. The stole used in administering Extreme Unction should be of a violet colour. This is the colour adopted by the Church to express sorrow and affliction, and used by her in the sacrament of Penance, and in all her offices during the penitential seasons.[4] It is prescribed for Ex-

[1] Supra, n. **798.**

[2] 16 Dec., 1826, *in una Gandaven.*, ad 2, Quæsiti, ii. n. 4623.

[3] Vid. chap. i. n. **84** et seq.

[4] Baruffaldi, tit. xviii. n. 19. Gavant., pars. i. tit. xviii. *De Coloribus Paramentorum*, rub. 5.

treme Unction also, which is regarded as the completion of Penance.[1] The priest can rarely, if ever, be obliged to administer the sacrament without at least the stole, as it is so easily carried. Baruffaldi observes[2] that sometimes the sick person might be alarmed if the priest presented himself at once clothed in the sacred vestments, and recommends, therefore, that he should first appear in his ordinary dress, and prepare the sick person for what is to follow. The wording of the rubric appears to convey that the priest puts on the surplice and stole only after he has placed the holy oil on the table, though St. Charles,[3] Catalani,[4] and others, would have him vested in these while carrying the oil to the house.

920. Being vested, he first presents the cross to be kissed by the sick person, who thus declares his faith and his hope in Christ crucified. The ritual, as we have seen, supposes the priest to have a cross with him, but if there be one already, as there ought to be,[5] in the room, it will do equally well. Then he sprinkles with holy water the sick person, the room, and all who are present, saying the usual antiphon, "*Asperges me*", etc. He sprinkles the sick person as here directed "**in modum crucis**", that is, he sprinkles, 1°, in front (of himself); 2°, on his (own) left; 3°, on his right.[6] If he has done so, however, before administering the Viaticum, he is not re-

[1] Con. Trid. Sess. xiv. *De Ext. Unct.*

[2] Tit. xxviii. n. 43.

[3] *Act. Med. Eccl.*, pars. iv. Instr. Ext. Unct. § *Ordo ministrandi*, pag. 451.

[4] Tit. v. cap. ii. § iv. n. iii.

[5] Supra, n. 904.

[6] De Herdt, n. 22. 2°. Vid. supra, n. 810.

quired to do so again when Extreme Unction immediately follows.[1]

§ VI.—**Quod si ægrotus voluerit confiteri, audiat illum, et absolvat. Deinde piis verbis illum consoletur, et de hujus sacramenti vi atque efficacia, si tempus ferat, breviter admoneat, et quantum opus sit, ejus animum confirmet, et in spem erigat vitæ æternæ.**

921. The priest should give the sick person an opportunity of confessing immediately before Extreme Unction; and hence, if any interval elapses between the Viaticum and Extreme Unction, he should, before he proceeds to anoint, ask him whether he desires to go to confession. This is, of course, unnecessary if Extreme Unction immediately follows the Viaticum;[2] but for greater security he may ask him to renew his sorrow and make a fresh act of contrition.

In any case, he should say a few words to console and encourage him, and, if time permits, explain briefly the advantages and effects of the sacrament. He may do so in his own words, or he may read the instruction or exhortation on the subject, which is usually found in an appendix to the Ritual. In his general instructions on this matter he should be careful to impress on the faithful the importance of receiving the sacrament in time, and to remove from their minds the senseless notion that whoever receives it must give up all hope of recovery.[3]

[1] De Herdt, n. 24, i. 4°.
[2] Vid. supra, n. 812.
[3] Vid. supra, n. 847.

§ VII.—**Postea dicat.** ℣. *Adjutorium nostrum, etc.*

922. In the ancient rituals given by Martene,[1] a considerable variety may be observed in the prayers to be recited before administering the sacrament, but all have the same object, and express nearly the same sentiments, as those here given. The first and third are found in some of the most ancient, as in the ritual of Beauvais,[2] and that of the Monastery of Pontlevoy, as old as the twelfth century.[3] The latter contains also the second prayer, "*Oremus et deprecamur*", etc., but not in the same part of the ceremony.

Saying "*Adjutorium*", etc., the priest makes the sign of the cross on himself.[4] It is not stated in what manner he is to make the sign of the cross at the words "*benedic* ✠ *nostræ conversationi*" . . . and again, "*benedicat* ✠ *hoc tabernaculum*". The words seem to imply that the blessing is intended for the house or chamber which the priest has entered, and we think, therefore, the sign should be made over the place in front of him without being directed to any special object. According to the ritual of Toulon, these prayers are to be said by the priest standing, uncovered, and turned partly towards the bed of the sick person, and partly towards the crucifix on the table.[5]

§ VIII.—**Quæ Orationes, si tempus non patiatur, ex parte, vel in totum poterunt omitti. Tum de more facta Confessione generali, Latino vel vulgari sermone, Sacerdos dicat:** *Misereatur, etc., Indulgentiam, etc.*

[1] Lib. i. cap. vii. art. iv.
[2] Loc. cit. ord. xx.
[3] Ord. xxv.
[4] Vid. supra, n. 811.
[5] Apud Dictionnaire des Cérémonies, etc., Art. *Ext. Unct.*, n. 23.

923. When the case is so urgent as to justify the omission of these prayers, they are afterwards to be supplied if the person survives, as is directed by a preceding rubric.[1] The "*Confiteor*" is said by the sick person himself, if he is able, the rubric expressly permitting it to be said either in Latin or in the vernacular, as in going to confession. If he is unable, it may be said by the clerk or assistant, or even by the priest himself.[2] Then the priest says: "*Misereatur tui*", etc., "*Indulgentiam*", etc., in the singular, as in administering the Viaticum.[3]

It was decided by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, that the "*Confiteor*" is here to be said, although it may have been said a few minutes before, as when the Viaticum immediately precedes; and is to be said even a third time if the indulgence in "articulo mortis" is given immediately after Extreme Unction.[4]

§ IX.—**Antequam Parochus incipiat ungere infirmum, moneat adstantes, ut pro illo orent; et ubi commodum fuerit, pro loco et tempore, et adstantium numero vel qualitate, recitent Septem Psalmos Pœnitentiales cum Litaniis, vel alias Preces, dum ipse Unctionis Sacramentum administrat. Mox dicat:** *In nomine Patris,* ✠ *et Filii, etc.*

924. "There is no sacrament", says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the administration of which "is accompanied with more prayers; and with good "reason, for then most particularly the faithful require

[1] Chap. xv. § xi.

[2] De Herdt, pars. vi. n. 22, 5°.

[3] De Herdt, l. c. Rit. Toul. l. c. n. 24. Vid. supra, n. 815.

[4] 5 Feb. 1841, *in Valentinen.*, ad. 6. n. dvi. Decreta Authentica, etc., a Prinzivalli, Bruxellis, 1862.

" the assistance of pious prayers, and, therefore, all who " may be present, but the pastor in particular, should pour " out their fervent aspirations to God in behalf of the sick " person, most earnestly recommending his life and salva- " tion to the divine mercy".[1]

Hence the ritual here directs the priest to invite all who are present to pray for the sick person. The prayers specially recommended are the penitential psalms and the litanies, these being most appropriate; but it is plain from the rubric, that any others, as, *e.g.*, the rosary, may be selected, and the priest would do well to suggest those that he thinks most suitable for the persons present. These prayers should be continued while the priest is administering the sacrament, but of course in so low a tone as not to distract or disturb him. The prayers are to be said kneeling, according to the " Instructions" of St. Charles.[2] At least the penitential psalms and the litanies should be recited " flexis genibus", as is apparent from the very title prefixed to them in the Ritual.

925. Immediately before applying the unction, the priest says: " *In Nomine Patris* ✠ *et Filii* ✠ *et Spiritus* ✠ " *Sancti extinguatur*", etc., making the sign of the cross three times over the sick person, as he pronounces the words. The ritual does not say explicitly how the sign is here to be made, but is understood as implying that it should be over the sick person.[3] The words " *in te*" indeed convey clearly enough that the priest is then

[1] Para. ii. cap. vi. n. 7.

[2] *Inst. Ext. Unct.* § *Ordo ministrandi*, etc., pag. 451.

[3] Baruff., tit. xxviii. n. 60. De Herdt, n. 22. 7°. Rit. Toul., l. c. n. 24.

turned towards the sick person, and the words "*per im-* "*positionem manuum nostrarum*", that he puts or raises his hand over him. It is enough, however, that he make the signs of the cross in the manner explained, for, as Baruffaldi observes,[1] this is here called an "impositio "manuum". Certainly no imposition of hands, distinct from this, is prescribed by the rubric, nor by any commentator we have seen except perhaps Catalani,[2] whose words are not very clear on the subject.

§ X.—**Deinde intincto pollice in Oleo sancto, in modum Crucis ungit infirmum in partibus hic subscriptis, aptando proprio loco verba formæ in hunc modum.**

926. Those present being engaged in praying devoutly for the sick person, the priest dips his thumb into the vessel of oil, pressing not the nail but the fleshy part on the cotton in which the oil is absorbed, and makes with it the sign of the cross on the several parts, pronouncing at the same time the words of the form as the rubric directs. A clerk should hold the ritual in a convenient position before him. Another should hold the candle, and the same may also hold the plate or salver containing the pellets of cotton. If there be a third, he may hold the vessel of oil,[3] otherwise the priest himself holds it, and indeed generally he will find it most convenient to hold it himself in his left hand. Baruffaldi[4] suggests that in this case there should be a purificator round the vessel to guard against effusion, but there is not much danger of effusion when the oil is absorbed in cotton.

[1] Loc. cit.
[2] Tit. v. cap. ii. § vii. n. iv.
[3] Baruff., tit. xxviii. n. 64 et seq.
[4] Loc. cit. n. 65.

Nearly all the ancient rituals cited by Martene[1] direct the unctions to be applied in the form of a cross. Our rubric prescribes the same, and a neglect of this in ordinary cases cannot be excused from venial sin.[2] It is not essential, however, and in case of necessity, need not be attended to.[3] What is here prescribed regards the usual administration of the sacrament.

927. We have already discussed what is to be done in cases of necessity.[4] Here we may add that in time of pestilence, if the priest apprehends danger from using his thumb, he may apply the oil by means of an instrument.[5] To preserve the oil from being tainted, the instrument, which may be of any material, ought to be wiped with cotton after each unction, before it is again dipped into the vessel of oil; or, if it be of wood, a different piece may be used for each unction and burned immediately after use. The mouth may be anointed in this way in case of hydrophobia, or any other disease in which there might be danger from contact with the saliva of the patient, but in such circumstances it is enough to anoint the cheek or part near the mouth.[6] If there be no other instrument at hand, the priest might use a little cotton dipped in the oil, being careful to burn it after the unction. We have already seen that in these cases of extraordinary danger, the priest, according to a highly pro-

[1] *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. vii. art. iv.

[2] St. Lig., n. 728.

[3] Baruff., n. 68.

[4] Supra, n. 871 et seq.

[5] St. Lig., n. 710 in parenth. De Herdt, n. 23. iii. Benedict XIV. *De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. xiii. cap. xix. n. 30.

[6] Vid. De Herdt, l. c.

bable opinion, may apply only a single unction with the general form.[1]

§ XI.—**Ad oculos.** *Per istam sanctam Unctionem* ✠ *et suam, etc.*

928. The unctions commence with the eyes, which should be closed. The oil is applied to the eye-lids,[2] and the words of the form are distributed, so that he will have made the cross on the right eyelid when he has pronounced the word *unctionem*, and on the left before he has completed the remaining words. The same is to be observed in anointing the other double organs.[3] It may be noted that the word "*Amen*" here is not a response, but belongs to the form, and should be said by the priest himself.[4]

When the organ is double, the unction always begins with the right.[5] The cross is formed by drawing, first, a line downwards, as *e. g.* in the present instance, from the eye-brow towards the cheek, and then one across it from left to right (of the priest).[6] In the Roman ritual only one cross is marked, though each of the unctions is to be made in the form of a cross. Two crosses are marked in some rituals, as in that of Liege.[7]

§ XII.—**Minister vero, si est in Sacris, vel ipsemet Sacerdos post quamlibet unctionem tergat loca inuncta novo globulo bombacii, vel rei similis, eumque in vase**

[1] Supra, n. 874.
[2] Baruff., tit. xxviii. n. 71.
[3] Vid. supra, chap. xv. § xvii.
[4] Modo Pratico, cap. ix.
[5] St. Lig., n. 711.
[6] De Herdt, n. 21. iii. 3°.
[7] Apud De Herdt, n. 21. iv.

mundo reponat, et ad Ecclesiam postea deferat, comburat, cineresque projiciat in Sacrarium.

929. It seldom happens in these countries that the priest is accompanied by another person in holy orders, and consequently he himself is usually obliged to do what is here prescribed. He should use a fresh pellet for each unction, but one suffices, even when the organ is double, as may be inferred from the number prepared according to the rubric.[1] He is to wipe the part anointed as here directed after each unction; but where there are two unctions for a single sense, he need not wipe the parts until he has completed both.[2]

There is danger sometimes, however, that the organ first anointed may come in contact with the dress or bedclothes, while the second is being anointed. This is the case with regard to the ears especially. Indeed it is hardly possible, when the head is resting on a soft pillow, that the lobe of one ear would not touch the pillow when the lobe of the other is being anointed. Hence the ritual of Toulon prescribes that the oil be wiped from the right ear before the left is anointed.[3] Falise recommends the same,[4] and it is, we think, a very laudable practice.

930. After use the pellet should not be put back on the plate or salver from which it was taken, but on another, or, better still, into a little pocket or bag, in which all can be conveniently carried to the church, where they are to be burned, and the ashes thrown into the sacrarium. Such a

[1] Supra, § i. [2] De Herdt, n. 21. iii. 6°.
[3] Dictionnaire Des Cérémonies, art. *Ext. Unct.*, n. 25.
[4] Part III^mo sec. i. chap. iv. n. 8.

pocket is sometimes made in the case which contains the holy oil. If so, it should be well closed, so as to prevent the cotton from touching the vessel. The priest is to put into the same place the crumbs of bread with which he has rubbed his fingers.[1] But generally in this country he is obliged to throw all into the fire.[2]

§ XIII.—Ad Aures.

931. The ears are to be anointed on the lobes or lower extremities.[3] This is the universal practice now, though some ancient rituals prescribe that the unction be applied to the hollow of the ear—"*deintus*"—as that of Troyes used in the tenth century,[4] that of Tours in the same century,[5] and that of Cambray in the thirteenth.[6]

932. The distribution of the words in applying the unctions here may be the same as in anointing the eyes. He may have the right ear anointed when he has completed the word *unctionem;* and the left, before he has got to the end. The rubric merely requires that the form be not completed until the second unction is applied,[7] but prescribes no particular distribution of the words. The ritual, indeed, has a cross marked after the word *unctionem*, but it does not imply that after this word the priest is to make a pause, during which the unction is to take place, and then complete the form. A pause of this kind might be sometimes inconveniently long. It is best, then, to adopt

[1] Baruff., n. 77.
[2] Vid. infra, § xix.
[3] Baruff., n. 78. De Herdt, n. 21. iv. iv. 2°.
[4] Apud Martene, lib. i. cap. vii. art. ord. iii.
[5] Ibid., ord. iv.
[6] Ibid., ord. xix.
[7] Supra, chap. xv. § xviii.

some distribution of the words in applying the unctions, and to adhere to it as far as possible. We believe the one we have mentioned is that which is commonly adopted in practice. By pronouncing the words slowly, the priest would have time enough to wipe the oil from the right ear before anointing the left, without being obliged to make any notable pause.

§ XIV.—Ad Nares.

933. Commentators are not agreed whether there should be two unctions here, one for each of the nostrils, or only one on the extremity of the nose for both. De Herdt[1] maintains that there should be only one, because, he says, the rituals do not mention "the nostrils" when speaking of the double organs, and because in the ritual of Liege only one cross is marked for the unction of the nostrils, while two are marked for the unction of the eyes, ears, hands, and feet. Hence, he concludes that though in strictness the organ is double, a single unction at the extremity of the nose suffices for the unction of the two nostrils.

934. The other opinion, however, which requires two unctions, is the more common, and is the one usually followed. Baruffaldi does not say expressly there should be two unctions here, but he evidently implies it, by saying, "*Ad nares* nempe ad narices quæ sunt nasi alæ laterales", and then observing on the next words, "*Ad os, compressis* "*labiis*", that here there is only one unction by which both lips are touched; thus clearly supposing that at the

[1] N. 21. iv. 8°.

preceding organs, including the "*nares*", there are two unctions.[1] Two crosses are marked in the "Instructions" of St. Charles "*Ad nares*", just as "*Ad oculos*", from which it is plain that according to him there should be two unctions here.[2] Two are prescribed also by the ritual of Toulon,[3] and by Falise.[4]

§ XV.—**Ad os, compressis labiis.**

935. Here there can be no doubt that there is only one unction by which both lips are anointed together, the mouth being firmly closed. But if the sick person have a difficulty of breathing, or if he cannot hear when told to close the mouth, or if there be any other inconvenience in requiring the mouth to be closed, it is enough to apply the unction to the upper or under lip alone.[5]

§ XVI.—**Ad manus. Et adverte quod Sacerdotibus, ut dictum est, manus non inunguntur interius, sed exterius.**

936. The hands are to be anointed on the palms, first the right and then the left. This applies to all except such as are in priest's orders. Deacons and other clerics inferior to priests have the hands anointed in the same way as laics.[6] The hands of a priest are anointed on the back.

[1] Tit. xxviii. n. 79, 80.

[2] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, pars. iv. Instruct. Ext. Unct. § *Ordo ministrandi*, etc., pag. 452.

[3] Dictionnaire des Cérémonies, l. c. n. 25.

[4] *Cours Abrégé*, etc., III^me^ partie, sect. i. chap. iv. n. 8.

[5] Baruff., n. 80. De Herdt, l. c. 4°. Falise, l. c.

[6] De Herdt, l. c. 5°.

We have before mentioned the reasons of congruity which are commonly assigned for this direction of the rubric.[1]

§ XVII.—Ad Pedes.

937. We have already seen[2] that the unction of the feet is not essential. In some places it is altogether omitted, according to De Herdt,[3] and St. Liguori seems to convey that as regards this unction the custom of each church may be followed.[4]

There is a diversity of usage as to the part of the foot to which the unction is applied. According to Baruffaldi,[5] it should be applied to the upper part of the foot, the instep, or metatarsus. The same is taught by Billuart,[6] and is prescribed by the ritual of Liege.[7] The ritual used in England also directs the upper part to be anointed. It has the rubric: *Ad pedes, in parte superiore.*

According to St. Liguori, the unction should be applied to the under part or the sole "*in plantis*".[8] The same is prescribed by St. Charles,[9] who is cited and followed by Catalani.[10] In Ireland, generally speaking, the practice is conformable to this second opinion, which also seems to accord better with the words of the form "*quidquid per gressum deliquisti*", the sole being the part that touches the

[1] Supra, n. 894.
[2] Supra, n. 895.
[3] N. 21. iii. 9°.
[4] Lib. vi. n. 710. *Unctio vero pedum.*
[5] Loc. cit. n. 84.
[6] *De Ext. Unct.*, art. ii. *Observanda*, 6°.
[7] Apud De Herdt, n. 21 iv. 6°.
[8] Lib. vi. n. 711.
[9] *Act. Med. Eccl.*, pars. iv. Instruct. Extr. Unct. § *Ordo ministrandi*, pag. 452.
[10] Tit. v. cap. ii. § xiv. n. 1.

ground in walking. The Sacred Congregation being consulted on the subject, decided that each one may follow the local usage.[1]

All are agreed that if there be any difficulty in getting at the part usually anointed, *e.g.* the sole, then the upper, or indeed any other part of the foot, may be anointed in its stead.[2]

§ XVIII.—**Ad lumbos, sive renes.**

Hæc autem unctio ad lumbos, ut dictum, est omittitur semper in fœminis, et etiam in viris, qui ob infirmitatem vix, aut sine periculo moveri non possunt.

938. The unction is applied to the loins, immediately above the "os ischion" or prominent hip-bone.[3] It is applied only on one side, as appears from the "Instructiones" of St. Charles,[4] in which only one cross is marked at this unction.

939. The loins, as the rubric here tells us, are never anointed in females. According to the usage of many places, they are not anointed in males either, in so much that the rituals published for use in these places omit altogether the rubric which refers to this unction.[5]

It is plain, however, that, according to the Roman Ritual, the unction of the loins is not to be omitted in anointing males, unless in the cases here mentioned. If there be any danger, or any serious inconvenience to the sick person,

[1] 27 Aug., 1886, *in Rhedonen*, ad l. n. 4780. Vid. subjectam annotationem Contin. Gardell.

[2] Baruff., n. 85. De Herdt, l. c.

[3] Baruff., n. 86.

[4] Loc. cit. pag. 452.

[5] Vid. supra, n. 893.

or any reasonable apprehension of such inconvenience, the priest is to omit it without scruple, but not otherwise.

§ XIX.—**Quibus omnibus peractis, Sacerdos dicit:** ***Kyrie eleison, etc.***

940. Having completed the unctions, the priest puts the vessel of holy oil on the table, rubs his thumb and any other finger that may have touched the oil, with the crumbs of bread, then washes his hands and dries them with a towel, and afterwards proceeds with the prayers. This is the order prescribed by St. Charles,[1] Baruffaldi,[2] Catalani,[3] De Herdt,[4] Falise,[5] etc. The rubric here says nothing of it, but seems rather to suppose that he proceeds immediately with the prayers. It is plain, however, from the preparations ordered in a previous rubric,[6] that he is to rub and wash the fingers after the unctions, and this seems to be the proper time, as otherwise there is danger that, with the oil still on them, they may come in contact with the book or with his vestments. If every thing be in readiness, there need be only a slight interruption. But if the priest fears that the interruption might be too long, and especially if the sick person be on the point of dying, he may continue the prayers, taking care that the fingers used in the unction shall touch nothing until the end.[7]

[1] Pars. iv. Instruct. Ext. Unct. § *Ordo Ministrandi*, pag. 452.
[2] Tit. xxviii. n. 89.
[3] Tit. v. cap. ii. § xvi. n. ii.
[4] Para. vi. n. 22. 9°.
[5] III^me^ partie sec. i. chap. iv. n. 8.
[6] Supra, § i.
[7] Baruff., n. 90. De Herdt, l. c. Falise, l. c.

941. The prayers here prescribed are found in the most ancient rituals, but not in the same part of the ceremony. The first "*Domine Deus qui*", etc., is found at the commencement, and the prayer "*Respice quæsumus*" towards the end, in the Pontifical of the monastery of Joumieges of the ninth century.[1] In the Sacramentary of Tours of the tenth century, both these prayers are placed at the commencement, and the prayer "*Domine Sancte "Pater*", etc., is amongst those at the end.[2]

It may be seen that in these prayers God is earnestly besought to grant to the sick person health of body as well as of soul, the restoration of corporal health being, as already stated, one of the effects of the sacrament. A knowledge that such is the purport of those prayers would help to remove that fear which some have of receiving the sacrament, and to which we have before adverted.[3]

It was decided by the Sacred Congregation,[4] that, when the person anointed is a female, there should be a change of gender in the versicles and prayers. The priest should say ℣. *Salvam fac ancillam tuam* instead of *Salvum fac servum tuum*, etc.

942. The prayers being concluded, the priest puts the vessel of holy oil into its case or cover, and puts the crumbs of bread he has used into the little bag or pocket, with the pellets of cotton, so that they may be carried to the church and burned together with them.[5] Some would require that even the water, in which he has washed his

[1] Martene, lib. i. cap. vii. art. iv. ordo i.
[2] Ibid. ord. iv.
[3] Supra, n. 847.
[4] 12 Aug., 1854, *in Lucionen*, ad 63.
[5] Baruff., n. 77 et n. 90.

hands, be carried to the church and thrown into the sacrarium.[1] This, however, would be generally speaking impracticable, and hence many authorities, as the "Modo Pratico",[2] the ritual of Toulon,[3] De Herdt,[4] etc., expressly state that the water may be thrown into the fire. De Herdt adds that this should be done by the priest himself or his assistant, and not by any of the domestics.

The same authorities also permit him to throw into the fire the piece of bread and the cotton which he has used.[5] With us, indeed, the priest is for the most part obliged to do so, as he cannot conveniently carry them back to the church, and in all such cases the fire is the best substitute for the sacrarium, as may be inferred from a rubric of the Roman Pontifical, which directs that the crumbs of bread, etc., used in removing the chrism from a chalice after its consecration, be thrown *either* into the fire *or* into the sacrarium. . . . . **Deinde extersiones projiciuntur in ignem "vel sacrarium".**[6]

§ XX.—**Ad extremum, pro personæ qualitate, salutaria monita breviter præbere poterit, quibus infirmus ad moriendum in Domino confirmetur, et ad fugandas dæmoniaci tentationes roboretur.**

943. Before he leaves, the priest should address to the sick person a few words of consolation and instruction, as here directed. In most rituals a brief exhortation to be

[1] *Act. Eccl. Med.*, loc. cit.
[2] Cap. ix. § *Rito di amministrare l'estrema unzione.*
[3] Dictionnaire des Cérémonies, etc., art. *Ext. Unct.*, n. 26.
[4] Loc. cit. [5] Locis cit.
[6] *De Consecratione Patenæ et Calicis* in fine.

used for the purpose is given in an appendix. It is, of course, very general, and such as might be addressed to one in any condition of life; but it at least suggests what the priest himself may easily adapt to the special circumstances of the individual "**pro personæ qualitate**". His own knowledge and piety will direct him better than any rule in what he should say, in order to inspire courage in resisting the temptations of the enemy, and resignation to the holy will of God, these being the dispositions most necessary to a Christian in danger of death.

§ XXI.—**Denique Aquam benedictam, et Crucem, nisi aliam habeat, coram eo relinquet, ut illam frequenter aspiciat, et pro sua devotione osculetur et amplectatur.**

944. The rubric supposes that the priest is accompanied by a minister who carries holy water and a crucifix to the house of the sick person.[1] He is now directed to leave them there, and to have the crucifix so placed that the sick person may often look at it, and even embrace and kiss it. If there be another crucifix, it is unnecessary to leave that which the priest brought with him, as the rubric here clearly conveys. It has been already stated that there ought to be a crucifix and holy water on the table prepared in the sick room,[2] and the present rubric shows that this is the more necessary when the priest comes unattended by any one, and, therefore, very often unable to have these requisites with him.

945. We need not dwell on the importance of having

[1] Vid. supra, § ii.

[2] Supra, n. **904.**

a crucifix placed before the eyes of the dying Christian. It speaks to him more eloquently than words of the mercy and love of God. It suggests to him those acts which are then most necessary for him—acts of sorrow for his sins, of faith in the great mysteries of redemption, of hope through the infinite merits of his Saviour, of love and of resignation to the will of Him who has done and suffered so much for him, etc.

§ XXII.—**Admoneat etiam domesticos et ministros infirmi, ut si morbus ingravescat, vel infirmus incipiat agonizare, statim ipsum Parochum accersant, ut morienten adjuvet, ejusque animam Deo commendet: sed si mors immineat, priusquam discedat, Sacerdos animam Deo rite commendabit.**

Quæ autem pertinent ad visitationem curamque infirmorum, et ad juvandos morientes, ad Commendationem Animæ et ad Exequias, infra suis locis præscribuntur.

946. It is of the greatest importance that the priest be present to assist the dying in the last agony, and he should therefore warn the attendants, as he is here directed, to give him notice, that he may be present if possible. We know that it is not possible for him, as a general rule, in large and populous parishes where the number of priests is small; but he may be very often present, and there are cases in which he should strive to be present to assist the dying, in preference to any other duty that might be pressing at the time. At all events, if the sick person survives some days after receiving Extreme Unction, and expresses a desire to see the priest again, the priest would be guilty of a grievous violation of duty if he failed to visit him.

947. Should the agony commence before the priest leaves the house, he ought to remain by the bedside and assist until the soul has departed, as directed in the "Ordo commendationis animæ", and "In expiratione". The rubric here refers him for further instruction to those parts of the ritual which treat of the visitation and care of the sick and dying.

In returning to the church or to his house, he should carry the holy oil as before directed.[1]

§ XXIII.—ADDITAMENTUM.

948. Before concluding this chapter, it may be useful to say a few words on the case in which Extreme Unction is to be administered to two or more at the same time. This may easily happen in a hospital, or in time of pestilence, or even of prevalent sickness though not pestilential. We have already seen what may be done as to the application of the matter and form in cases of urgent necessity or of very great danger.[2] But we now speak of cases that are not so urgent, and in which there is time enough to administer the sacrament in the ordinary way to each, and we may inquire whether in these it be lawful to recite any of the prayers or perform any of the ceremonies in common for all, as is done in administering Baptism to a number together.[3]

949. The ritual makes no provision for this case, nor is it touched on in any authority we have seen except in

[1] Supra, § iii.

[2] Supra, n. 871, et seq.

[3] Supra, chap. iv. § xxv.

De Herdt,[1] and in an answer to a correspondent in the "Melanges Théologiques".[2] In both it is decided that some of the prayers may be recited for a number in common. In fact the case may be regarded as analogous to that of Baptism or Orders administered to a number; and from what is prescribed in the ritual and the pontifical regarding these sacraments, it may be inferred that, in administering Extreme Unction, the prayers which are accompanied by no actions or ceremonies, may be recited for a number in common. This view is confirmed by the ritual itself in the last of the rubrics regarding the visitation of the sick, which prescribes that the prayers be said in the plural, should there be a number together in the same apartment; and it is further confirmed by an answer of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, regarding the case in which two or more marriages are celebrated together. The priest, having received the consent and pronounced for each the words "*Ego vos*", etc., may bless the rings, and read the benedictions for all in common.[3]

950. If the priest, then, chooses to act on this opinion, he may proceed thus. Having entered the sick chamber with the usual salutation "*Pax huic*", etc., he places the holy oil on the table, sprinkles the holy water, and after this presents the crucifix to be kissed by each, giving him at the same time an opportunity of confessing. The rubric prescribes that the crucifix be presented before the

[1] Para. vi. n. 24. ii.

[2] VI^me^ Serie, pag. 503.

[3] 1 Sept., 1841, cit. apud. Mel. Theol., l. c. et apud. Falise, *Sac. Rit. Cong. Decr.* V. Bened. Nup. in nota, 7.

sprinkling of holy water,[1] but we think the order may be changed for greater convenience, should there be a number in different parts of the same room, otherwise the priest would be obliged to go round them all to present the crucifix, and afterwards to give each an opportunity of confessing.

He may then address the exhortation to all in common, and recite for all in common the three prayers "*Introeat*", etc., which require no change of number, as is plain from reading them. The "*Confiteor*" is then said by each of them if he is able, otherwise by an assistant, or even by the priest himself for all.[2] The priest says the "*Misereatur vestri*", etc., and gives notice to those who are present to pray while he is administering the sacrament.

Judging from the exorcism in Baptism,[3] we are inclined to think that he may say the prayer "*In nomine Patris* ✠", etc., for all in common, making the signs of the cross over all, and changing "*te*" into "*vobis*". But in the absence of any clear authority on the point, it is better to say it for each just before commencing to anoint him. The unctions of course are applied to each individually. These finished, the priest washes his hands,[4] and says the versicles and prayers to the end for all in common, making the necessary changes in number and, if all be females,[5] in gender.

A priest who may be called on to administer the sacrament in this way to a number together, would do well to mark the necessary changes in the margin of his ritual.

[1] Supra, § v.
[2] Supra, n. 923.
[3] Supra, n. 370.
[4] Supra, n. 940.
[5] Vid. supra, n. 365.

951. It has been before observed that in Ireland, a other countries similarly circumstanced, the priest, wh called to attend the sick, finds it expedient, as a gener rule, to go prepared to administer both the Viaticum a Extreme Unction. We have already stated how in the circumstances he is to carry with him the Blessed Sacr ment and the holy oil.[1] And it may be useful to sta briefly here how he should proceed so as to conform nearly as he can to what the rubrics require.

952. Having entered the chamber with the salutatio "*Pax huic*", etc., he sprinkles the holy water, sayi "*Asperges*", etc., and says the versicles and the pray "*Exaudi nos*", etc.

He then approaches the sick person, addresses to hi a few words of instruction or exhortation suited to h condition, and hears his confession.[2]

953. If now he judges it expedient to administer t Viaticum and Extreme Unction, he lays aside the viol stole, and puts on the surplice and white stole.[3] He ma find it convenient in these circumstances to have a doubl stole, such as has been before described.[4]

He then takes out the pyxis and places it on the tabl He may place the holy oil on the table at the same time not on the corporal, but to one side.[5] The reason wh he does not place the pyxis on the table on first enterin the house has been intimated before.[6] He visits now fo the first time, as we suppose, and he does not know unti he has heard the person's confession whether he is in

[1] Supra, n. 807 et 913.
[2] Supra, n. 809 et seq.
[3] Supra, n. 798-918.
[4] Chap. iii. n. 279.
[5] Supra, n. 909 et n. 915.
[6] Supra, n. 812.

condition to receive the Viaticum. It may be that he is not. It may be that he cannot be absolved.[1] If, in such a case, the pyxis had been placed publicly on the table, either he should administer the sacrament, though knowing that it would be received unworthily (and he would be even bound to do so if the sick person demanded it),[2] or those present might take occasion to suspect that the sick person could not be absolved, etc. He effectually guards against this danger by not placing the pyxis on the table until he has first heard the confession.

The "*Confiteor*", etc., is said and the sacrament administered with the ceremonies before explained.[3] But if he has brought more than one particle,[4] he leaves the pyxis on the table, and does not give benediction with it until he has finished all.[5]

954. After the prayer "*Domine Sancte*", etc., he changes the white stole for a violet one, and proceeds to administer Extreme Unction.

Omitting the salutation, and the sprinkling of holy water,[6] he may, if time permits, say a few words to the sick person on the nature and effects of the sacrament. Then, having given him the crucifix to kiss, he says the versicles and prayers "*Introeat Domine*", etc., and the "*Confiteor*" is repeated with the "*Misereatur tui*", etc.[7]

Those present having been on their knees during the administration of the Viaticum, should be requested to continue kneeling and pray for the sick person before

[1] Supra, n. **768.**
[2] Vid. supra, n. **631.**
[3] Supra, n. **814** et seq.
[4] Vid. supra, n. **838.**
[5] De Herdt, n. 24. i. 4°.
[6] Supra, n. **914.**
[7] Supra, n. **920, 921, 923.**

the Blessed Sacrament,[1] while he administers Extreme Unction as before directed,[2] taking care in going to or leaving the table to genuflect, and also to avoid, as far as possible, turning his back to the pyxis.[3]

955. Having said the prayers "*Domine Deus*", etc. . . . . "*Respices quæsumu*", etc., "*Domine Sancte*", etc., he may give the benediction "in articulo mortis", if he has the faculty.[4]

Omitting the "*Pax huic*", etc., and the "*Asperges*",[5] he says a word or two on the efficacy of the benediction, invites the sick person to renew his sorrow by an act of contrition, and exhorts him to patience and resignation.[6]

He then says the versicles and the prayer "*Clemen-*" "*tissime Deus*", etc. The "*Confiteor*" is said the third time, and he proceeds as below directed.[7]

956. Having given the Apostolic Benediction, he may say a word of advice and instruction as recommended in a preceding rubric.[8]

Lastly, just before leaving, he gives the benediction with the pyxis, and puts it up securely as before.[9]

957. It is hardly necessary to observe that, in case of very urgent necessity, he should omit in each of the three functions all that he is allowed to omit, confining himself to the parts that are essential, according to what is said in treating of each.

[1] Supra, n. **924**
[2] Supra, n. **926 et seq.**
[3] De Herdt, l. c. 5°.
[4] Vid. infra, chap. **xvii.** § **ii.**
[5] Vid. infra, n. **968.**
[6] Infra, n. **972.**
[7] Vid. chap. **xvii.** § v. et § vi.
[8] Supra, § **xxi.**
[9] Vid. supra, n. **838.**

CHAPTER XVII.

RITE TO BE OBSERVED BY PRIESTS DELEGATED TO GIVE THE APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION "IN ARTICULO MORTIS".

RITUS BENEDICTIONIS APOSTOLICÆ IN ARTICULO MORTIS A SACERDOTIBUS AD ID DELEGATIS IMPERTIENDÆ.

958. This title or chapter is not found in any of the rituals published before the time of Benedict XIV., for it was he who prescribed the present formula. From the earliest ages of the Church, bishops were invited, from time to time, to give their blessing to the dying,[1] and when given by the Popes or those specially delegated by them, it was, no doubt, very often accompanied by a plenary indulgence. We have, most probably, an instance of this in the indulgence granted to St. Clare by Innocent IV., as we read in her life given in the Roman Breviary.[2] At all events it is certain that the Popes have power to grant such indulgences, and that this power has been frequently used in the Church.[3]

959. Before the time of Benedict XIV., they readily granted to bishops the faculty of giving, by themselves,

[1] Catalani, tit. v. cap. vi n. ii. [2] Catal., l. c.
[3] Vid. Bouvier, *Traité des Indulgences*, part. ii^me^ chap. ii.

or by priests whom they were permitted to delegate in special cases, a benediction with plenary indulgence to the sick "in articulo mortis". But this great Pope, in the bull "*Pia mater*", etc., extended the faculty very considerably. According to the analysis of the bull given by Bouvier,[1] he decreed:

1° That though previously granted to bishops for only three years, it should thenceforth continue as long as they held their sees.

2° That they might delegate one or more priests, secular or regular, to impart this indulgence in the city or other parts of the diocese, as the good of souls might seem to require, with power to withdraw this faculty from those to whom they granted it, and substitute others according to their discretion.

3° That titular bishops who are transferred to other sees, or are newly instituted, should not have this faculty until they ask and obtain it from the Holy See, but that they should obtain it when asked, not for three years only, but as long as they retain their sees.

4° He would have the same favour granted to inferior prelates, who have an independent territory and jurisdiction over the clergy and people, provided they visit, at stated times, the "limina apostolorum", and give an account of the state of their churches to the Holy See.

5° He declares that this faculty does not cease by the death of the Pope who granted it, since it belongs to gracious jurisdiction delegated indefinitely, to subsist until it is revoked, or until the death of the person delegated. It does not cease, even for the priests who have obtained

[1] Loc. cit.

it, by the death or the translation to another see of the prelate who delegated them.

6° That in permitting bishops and other prelates to delegate as many priests as they may think necessary to apply this indulgence to the dying, he does not mean to exempt them from going themselves, when they can, to administer this consolation, above all to the poor and those who are most abandoned.

7° That care be taken in catechisms and public instructions to explain to the people the doctrine of the Church with regard to the temporal punishment due to sin; the obligation of satisfying God's justice, by fasting, alms, prayers, and other good works; and the danger of presumptuously relying on the efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance and a plenary indulgence at the hour of death; for, he says, it is uncertain what kind our death may be, whether we shall receive the plenary indulgence at that last moment, whether even in case the external rite be applied, we shall reap the fruit of it, or to what extent we shall be benefited by it.

8° He prescribes that all priests who have to assist the dying, and apply to them this indulgence, "in articulo "mortis", shall excite them to sorrow for their sins, and inspire them with sentiments of fervent love of God and perfect resignation to His holy will, so as to accept death from His hand in punishment for their sins. It is this disposition especially which he requires in order that they may gain the fruit of the indulgence. "Hoc enim præcipue "opus in hujusmodi articulo constitutis imponimus et "injungimus, quo se ad indulgentiæ plenariæ fructum con-"sequendam, præparent atque disponant".

9° Lastly, to leave nothing undecided, he prescribed the formula here given in the ritual to be used in the application of the indulgence.

§ I.—Benedictio in articulo mortis cum soleat impertiri post Sacramenta Pœnitentiæ, Eucharistiæ, et Extremæ Unctionis, illis infirmis qui vel illam petierint, dum sana mente et integris sensibus erant, seu verisimiliter petiissent, vel dederint signa contritionis; impertienda iisdem est, etiamsi postea linguæ, cæterorumque sensuum usu sint destituti, aut in delirium, vel amentiam inciderint. Excommunicatis vero, impœnitentibus, et qui in manifesto peccato mortali moriuntur, est omnino deneganda.

960. The circumstances in which the benediction is to be given or refused, as here stated, are evidently the same as those in which Extreme Unction is to be given or refused, and have been considered in a preceding chapter.[1] It may be doubted, however, whether the benediction is restricted like Extreme Unction to such as are in danger of death from bodily sickness, whether it may not be given to one who is in danger of death from any other cause, *e.g.* to a convict about to be executed.[2] The words of the Bull "*Pia mater*", as well as of the rubrics here, undoubtedly seem to suppose that the person receiving the benediction is "**ægrotus, infirmus**", etc. Now it may be that this is supposed or required strictly *as a condition;* and it may be that the words are used, not to express a condition, but simply to describe the case that usually occurs. It is quite uncertain, and depends altogether on the intention of the Pontiff. But in the absence of any authority against it, the benediction may be given at least conditionally.[3]

[1] Supra, chap. xv. § vii. et ix. [2] Vid. supra, n. 908.
[3] Vid. "Analecta Juris Pontificii", VI^me^ Serie, pag. 2010.

961. The Sacred Congregation decided that this benediction should be given to children who are thought too young to be admitted to Holy Communion.[1] This decision is in perfect accordance with what has been said regarding the administration of Extreme Unction to children in the same circumstances.[2]

The question of course regards children who have attained the use of reason; otherwise, being incapable of sinning, they would be also incapable of receiving an indulgence.[3]

962. It is certain that the benediction may be repeated in the circumstances in which Extreme Unction may be repeated, that is, when the sick person, having partially recovered, relapses, and is again in danger of death.[4] But in a case of protracted illness, where the same danger still continues, it cannot be repeated. Both points have been expressly decided by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences.[5]

It had been long before decided by the same congregation that a plenary indulgence "in articulo mortis", given simply and without any other declaration, should be understood strictly, as gained only when death actually occurs.[6] It would be different, of course, if the terms of the brief contained the clause "*etiamsi mors non sequatur*", which is contained in some referred to by Bouvier in his discussion of this matter.[7]

[1] 16 December, 1826, *in una Gandaven*, ad Dub. 4. Quæs. v. n. 4623.
[2] Supra, n. 860. [3] Vid. *Annotationem*, Contin. Gardellini in Decr. cit.
[4] Vid. supra, chap. xv. § xiv.
[5] 20 Sept. 1775, *Vindana in Britannia Minori* ad 6^m. n. ccclvii. 12 Feb. 1842, *Gandaven*, n. dxxix. [6] 23 April, 1675, ad 1^m. n. x.
[7] *Traité des Indulgences*, part. ii. chap. ii. Qu. 3^me.

963. If the person, however, be not in the state of grace when the benediction is given, it is of no avail, and should be repeated when he recovers the state of grace.

But should he, after having received it in the state of grace, again fall into mortal sin, he would receive the fruit of the indulgence at the moment of death, provided he had, in the mean time, recovered the state of grace; and, therefore, in this case, the benediction should not be repeated.[1]

964. Bouvier observes that in the diocese of Mans it is usual to give the benediction immediately after Extreme Unction. This, undoubtedly, should be the ordinary rule. It is evident from what is said regarding the dispositions required,[2] that the priest should give it, if possible, while the person has still the full use of his faculties, and should not, therefore, wait till the last moment. If there be no immediate danger, however, and if the priest can conveniently return, it may be sometimes expedient to defer it for another visit.[3]

§ II.—**Habens predictam facultatem, ingrediendo cubiculum, ubi jacet infirmus, dicat:** *Pax huic domui, etc.*, **ac deinde aegrotum, cubiculum, et circumstantes aspergat Aqua benedicta, dicendo Antiphonam:** *Asperges me, etc.*

965. There are few, if any bishops, who fail to obtain this important faculty, which is so readily granted by the Holy See; and as they can delegate the same to as many priests as the good of souls may seem to them to require,

[1] Vid. Bouvier, l. c.
[2] Supra, n. 959—8°.
[3] Vid. Bouvier, l. c.

they usually grant it to all the parochial clergy, and to all whom they approve for hearing confessions, since there is not one of these who may not at some time be called on to assist the dying.

966. An answer of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences[1] declares that a bishop cannot delegate the faculty to *all* the confessors of his diocese. But this answer, interpreted by the one which immediately follows,[2] as well as by the words of the bull "*Pia Mater*", already referred to,[3] must, we think, be understood with this limitation, "unless the bishop may in the circumstances of his diocese "judge it expedient for the good of souls to delegate it "to all". It is certain at all events that many bishops do delegate the faculty to all whom they approve for hearing confessions, and no one doubts the licitness or the validity of such delegation.[4]

967. This delegation, according to Bouvier,[5] ought to be express and positive, and, for greater security, though not necessarily, in writing. At least a priest cannot regard it as included in the approval he may have received to hear confessions unless it be formally expressed. The bishop may have intended to convey it at the same time, but the intention does not suffice, unless it be expressed.

968. The rubric supposes that the priest comes for the purpose of giving the benediction, and in this case, on entering the room he says, "*Pax huic domui*", and

[1] 20 Sept. 1775, *Vindana*, ad 2^m partem. Dub. 8^vi n. ccclvii.
[2] Ad. 3^m partem ejusdem Dub. [3] Supra, n. 959—2°.
[4] Cfr. Bouvier, part. ii^me chap. ii^me. "Melanges Theologiques", III^me Serie 2^me Cahier, pag. 324.
[5] Loc. cit.

sprinkles the holy water as here directed.[1] De Herdt[2] recommends for greater security that he do so even when he gives the benediction immediately after Extreme Unction, because the rubric occurs in the formula of Benedict XIV., and may therefore express a strict condition of the indulgence. But there can hardly, we think, be a reasonable doubt that in that case, having already said the "*Pax huic domui*", and sprinkled the water on entering the room, he may safely omit the repetition.[3]

969. He should be vested in surplice and violet stole,[4] and therefore should retain the vestments he has used in giving Extreme Unction, if he gives the benediction immediately after.

§ III.—**Quod si ægrotus voluerit confiteri, audiat illum, et absolvat. Si confessionem non petat, excitet illum ad eliciendum actum contritionis; de hujus Benedictionis efficacia ac virtute, si tempus ferat, breviter admoneat; tum instruat, atque hortetur, ut morbi incommoda ac dolores in anteactæ vitæ expiationem libenter perferat, Deoque sese paratum offerat ad ultro acceptandum quicquid ei placuerit, et mortem ipsam patienter obeundam in satisfactionem pœnarum, quas peccando promeruit.**

970. The Church, anxious about the spiritual welfare of her children at every period of their lives, becomes more and more solicitous about them as death approaches, knowing that their salvation depends on their dying in a state of grace. Hence she is ready to administer to them over and over again the holy sacrament of Penance, instituted

[1] Vid. supra, n. 920. [2] Pars. vi. n. 25. vi. [3] Vid. supra, n. 914.
[4] Caval., vol. iv. cap. xxvii. *De Benedictione in vita et mortis articulo*, Decr. vii. in fine. De Herdt, l. c.

by her Divine Founder as the sovereign remedy for sin. She directs the priest, as often as he visits the sick to ascertain whether they desire to confess, and if so, to hear and absolve them; and it is her wish that, if possible, he should be present with them in the last agony.

971. St. Liguori recommends confessors who assist the dying to give them absolution frequently while they have the use of their senses: "Dum infirmus adhuc sensibus "viget, absolutionem pluries ei conferri post brevem re- "conciliationem juvabit, ut ita ille magis circa statum "gratiæ securus reddatur, si forsan præteritæ confessiones "invalidæ fuissent, aut saltem gratiæ augmentum recipiat, "necnon purgatorii pœnæ ei minuantur".[1]

"Juxta præscriptum et mentem Ritualis Romani", says the Council of Baltimore, "sedulus sit Pastor animarum "in visitandis infirmis et agonizantibus etiam postquam "ultima receperunt sacramenta; et illos exhortetur, con- "soletur, adjuvet; et elicito ab iis, si possint, novo con- "fessionis et contritionis actu, novâ identidem donet abso- "lutione".[2]

972. In the present case, if the sick person does not confess, the priest should endeavour to excite him to contrition, as is directed not only by the rubric here, but in the bull itself, according to the analysis already given.[3] It does not appear, however, that this is rigorously required as a condition of the indulgence, but it gives greater security that the person is in the state of grace, which is absolutely necessary to gain any indulgence. He should then simply explain to him, if time permits, the efficacy of

[1] *Praxis Confess.*, n. 276.
[2] Prov. v. Decr. xi.
[3] Supra, n 959—8°.

the benediction he is about to impart, and especially he should exhort him to be patient and resigned to the will of God in his sufferings, and to be ready to accept death itself in satisfaction for his sins and as a punishment deserved by them. This is the disposition on which the Pontiff chiefly insists, as we have already seen.[1]

§ IV.—**Tum pils ipsum verbis consoletur, in spem erigens, fore, ut ex divinæ munificentiæ largitate eam pœnarum remissionem, et vitam sit consecuturus æternam.**

973. He should then console and encourage him, inspiring him with a confident hope of obtaining, through the mercy and goodness of God, a full remission of all his sins, and eternal happiness in the next life. He may use any words which his piety may suggest, but it would be difficult to find any more appropriate than those short sentences given in the Ritual itself in its instructions to the pastor on the mode of assisting the dying.

§ V.—**Sacerdos dicat:** *Adjutorium nostrum, etc.*
Tum dicto ab uno ex Clericis adstantibus *Confiteor*, **Sacerdos dicat,** *Misereatur, etc.*, **Deinde:** *Dominus noster, etc.*

974. The form here given is that prescribed by Benedict XIV., and of course should be adhered to in every particular when circumstances permit. It was doubted whether the "*Confiteor*" should be said, if the benediction be given immediately after Extreme Unction, since it has been said just before the administration of that sacrament;

[1] Supra, n. 959—60.

but the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences decided that it should again be said, the question proposed being, whether it should be recited thrice when the Viaticum, Extreme Unction, and this benediction follow in immediate succession.[1]

975. The priest says "*Misereatur tui*", etc., as in administering the Viaticum, and makes the sign of the cross over the sick person when saying *In Nomine Patris*, etc., and also at the end while saying "*Pater, Filius*", etc.[2]

§ VI.—**Si vero infirmus sit adeo morti proximus, ut neque Confessionis generalis faciendæ, neque præmissarum precum recitandarum tempus suppetat, statim Sacerdos Benedictionem ei impertiatur.**

976. It is difficult to determine what part of the form given is essential in order to apply the indulgence. Nothing is decided here by the ritual, which gives the form prescribed by the bull of Benedict XIV. It is certainly sufficient to commence with the words "*Dominus noster*", etc., but is it necessary to commence with them? Falise seems to think it is.[3] Cavalieri would have the priest commence in the case here supposed with the words: "*Ego facultate mihi ab Apostolica sede tributa Indulgentiam*", etc.[4] Catalani maintains that the form to be used is given in the last words, "*Benedicat te omnipotens Deus*", etc.[5]

977. The formula is given in many editions of the Roman Breviary, as well as in the Ritual; but the rubric

[1] 5 Feb. 1841, *in Valentinen*, ad 6^m^ n. dvi.
[2] De Herdt, n. 25. vi.
[3] Part. iii. sec. ii. chap. i. § iii.
[4] Vol. iv. cap. xxvii. Decr. v. n. iii.
[5] Tit. v. cap. vi. § vii.

in the Breviary is more explicit, for it says, "Si vero in-"firmus sit . . . statim ei benedictionem impertiatur dicens: *Dominus noster*, etc., which would seem to favour the opinion of Falise. But then it adds: "Et si mors prox-"ime urgeat, dicat: *Indulgentiam plenariam et remissionem* "*omnium peccatorum tibi concedo in nomine Patris et Filii* "*et Spiritus Sancti*". This last form is given in the Ritual only as part of the prayer, *Dominus noster*, etc., but there is no reason to doubt its validity since it is given in breviaries printed in Rome. Taking, then, the rubric of the Breviary to be the best interpreter of the Ritual, we would follow it in practice, commencing with "*Dominus noster*", etc., unless when the person is just expiring, in which case we would at once say: "*Indulgentiam*", etc.[1]

978. It may be observed that this is not the only plenary indulgence that can be obtained at the hour of death. A great many have been granted for this hour to the faithful, who are members of certain pious confraternities, who practise certain devotions, or who have rosaries, crosses, medals, etc., to which the indulgences are attached, provided they comply with the requisite conditions.[2] The titles are altogether distinct, and the conditions are not incompatible. It has been decided by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, that, when communion is required as a condition of the indulgence, the same communion may suffice for several plenary indulgences.[3]

979. The conditions required for those granted "in "articulo mortis" are very easy. They are, for the most

[1] Cfr. "Analecta", IV^me^ Serie, pag. 2010.

[2] Bouv., *Traité des Indulgences*, partie ii^me^ chap. ii^me^ Qu. 4^me^.

[3] 29 Maii, 1841, *Briocen.* ad. 1^m^ n. dxi.

part, those acts which should, in any event, be frequently elicited by the Christian in danger of death, acts of contrition, acts of the love of God, and of perfect resignation to His holy will, and the invocation of the sacred name with the heart, if not with the lips.

To gain the indulgences attached to rosaries, crosses, medals, etc., it is enough to take the blessed object in the hand, or to have it about or near the person, while making the acts prescribed, which are usually those just mentioned. The ministry of a priest is not necessary, though it is of course very useful in assisting the sick person to make the acts required.[1] It is probable that, even by virtue of a single concession, the indulgence may be gained as often as the prescribed acts are repeated,[2] but there is no reason to doubt that several may be gained when the titles are distinct.[3]

With respect to the intention, it is sufficient that one have that of gaining all the indulgences he can by the acts he performs. It is not necessary to think of them in particular, nor even to know that they are attached to the acts.[4] It is even probable that an intention of gaining the indulgence is not required at all, provided the work to which it is attached be done. St. Liguori seems to think that, at all events, it is enough to have an interpretative intention.[5]

980. The priest, then, should not fail to suggest to the

[1] Bouvier, loc. cit. Qu. 5^me^.
[2] Busemb., apud. St. Lig., lib. vi. n. 534–4.
[3] Ibid, 5. Vid. Bouvier, l. c. Qu. 4^me^.
[4] Bouv., par. i. chap. vii. art. i. § ii.
[5] Lib. vi. n. 534–14.

sick person this easy yet powerful means of satisfying divine justice. It is true that if he had the happine gaining one plenary indulgence, he could not ga second for himself at the same time, for even one incl a complete remission of all the temporal punishment to his sins; but it is hard to reckon in any instanc the presence of all those conditions, and especial those perfect dispositions which are necessary to g plenary indulgence in its full extent.[1] But, althou be not gained in its whole extent, it may be gained tially,[2] and if many be gained in this way, the eff all united may come very near, and, when there complete renunciation of all venial sins, may be equ the full effect of a plenary indulgence.[3]

[1] Vid. Bouv., chap. vii. art. i. § i. St. Lig., n. 534. *Certum c*
[2] St Lig., ibid.
[3] Vid. De Lugo, *De Pœnitentia*, Disp. xxvii. sec. vi. n. 91

APPENDIX.

DECREES OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES.

The following are the decrees referred to in the present volume. They are here given with their numbers and dates as they are found, in chronological order, in the third edition of Gardellini (*vid. Introduction*, n. 37). The few not found in Gardellini are added under a distinct heading. At the end of each decree will be found the number or numbers under which it is referred to in the volume.

289. *Baren.*, 28 Jan., 1606. "In civitate Baren., solere presbyteros Ecclesiæ S. Nicolai ejusdem civitatis dum mannam ejusdem S. Nicolai ad infirmos deferunt, illam deferre superpelliceo indutos solemniter, cum luminaribus et lanternis, ac si Sacramentum Extremæ Unctionis ad infirmos deferrent, et S. R. C. pro parte Archiepiscopi dictæ civitatis expositum fuit, et petitum, an conveniat? Eadem S. R. C. "non modo mannam S. Nicolai, sed neque Extremæ-Unctionis Oleum solemniter cum superpelliceo, ac lanternis ad infirmos deferendum esse", respondit et declaravit. **910.**

629. *Manilien.* 2 Maii 1626. "Archiepiscopus Manilien. petiit declarari: An Episcopi Philippinarum possint astringere Parochos Regulares ad observandum in praxi caput Ritualis Romani de Sacramento Pœnitentiæ in eo, quod dicit "quod si confitendi desiderium suum per se, sive per alios ostenderit infirmus, absolvendus?" Et S. C. respondit: Placere sibi quod si non est introducta observatio Ritualis Romani, introducatur". **64.**

753. *Dub. Urbis.* 12 Jul. 1628. "1 An Canonicis usum Cappæ et Rochetti habentibus liceat sacramenta administrare cum solo Rochetto et deposita Cappa? Resp.: Ad 1. Sacramenta esse administranda cum superpelliceo et Stola juxta Rituale Romanum. **121.**

1319. *Pisauren.*, 20th April, 1641. "Patres S. Caroli Congregationis Clericorum regularium petierunt responderi: An liceat in nocte Nativitatis Domini, post cantatam primam missam, alias duas immediate celebrare, et communicare fideles? Et S. R. C. respondit: Nullo modo licere, sed omnino prohibendum". **710.**

1360. *Trium Missarum*, etc., 7 Dec., 1641. "Cum superioribus diebus consulta hæc S. R. C. an esset permittendum celebrari, in media nocte Nativitatis Domini, post missam decantatam successive alias duas missas, et in eis sacram communionem exhiberi fidelibus eam deposcentibus? Et respondisset: "Non esse permitten-

dum sed omnino utrumque prohibendum"; nihilominus nonulli Regulares asserentes id licere supplicarunt audiri; et S. C. ipsis auditis cum procuratoribus et advocatis, ad relationem Em. Palloti, stetit in decretis, et respondit: Iterum prohibendum tam sacerdotibus celebrare volentibus, quam confluentibus media nocte ad ecclesias et communionem deposcentibus". 710.

1496. *Marianen.*, 16 Ap., 1644. "Moniales SS. Annunciationis de Bastia supplicarunt pro facultate asservandi in earum Ecclesia SS. Eucharistiam. Et S. C. respondit: Aut monasterium est canonice erectum, et non indiget: aut non, et non est approbandum". 597.

1907. *Galliarum*, 13 Jul., 1658. "Regularibus regni Galliæ declarare petentibus: An in communione quæ inter Missæ sacrificium peragitur, sit prius ministrandum SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ministro Missæ inservienti, an vero monialibus vel cæteris ibidem præsentibus. S. R. C. responderi mandavit: In casu prædicto ministrum sacrificii, non ratione præeminentiæ, sed ministerii, præferendum esse cæteris quamvis dignioribus". 718.

2008. *Matherana*, 22 Nov., 1659. "Petrus Antonius Gallus cantor Ecclesiæ loci Lattezzæ Matheranæ diœcesis, declarari postulavit: An Archipresbytero ejusdem loci liceat in administrando populis SS. Sacramento, manum porrigere osculandam? Resp.: Non licere, et contrariam consuetudinem esse abusum omnino tollendum". 686.

2127. *Andrien.*, 3 Sept., 1661. Ad dirimendas controversias . . . . declaravit S. R. C. "Patenæ suppositionem per sacerdot cotta indutum in Communione nerali, quæ per Dignitates agi retinendam esse". 651.

2350. *Florentin.*, 19 Dec., 16 "S. R. C. ad preces Laure Vanni præpositi S. Joannis I rentiarum, declaravit: "Tam tum baptizandi, quam alias fu tiones præparatorias pro baptiz dis Turcis, et aliis ad fidem veni tibus, esse faciendas per eumd sacerdotem baptizantem, et co quenter ipsum præpositum, pr in Rituali disponitur, et us adhuc servatum fuit, a quo so recedendum non esse", censuit: ita decrevit, et servari mandav 543.

2504. *Oritana.* 21 Jun. 16 S. R. C. censuit—"Servand esse decretum Vicarii in Ecc sia Cathedrali, ne in poster celebrentur Missæ Defunctor nisi cum colore nigro vel alt violaceo. Quo vero ad alias I clesias, Planetas hujus modi fac non valentes, et proinde quolil colore uti solitas, audiendum e eundem Vicarium". 708.

2602. *Conchen.*, 3 Sept., 167 "In renovatione, quæ quolib octavo die fieri debet de Au Eucharistiæ Sacramento, consu debet tum Hostia, tum etiam pa ticulæ, quæ existunt in tabern culo, post sumptionem Sanguir ante purificationem; illa ve verba, quæ habentur in Missa cap. 10, num. 5, nempe: *Si ve adsint hostiæ consecratæ, etc.*, p sunt intelligi de hac renovatio eque, ac de nova confectio Sacramenti reservandi pro al die". Et ita censuit S. R. C. 61 622.

2859. *Mexicana*, 12 Mar., 167 VIII. "In multis Ecclesiis sole celebrari Missæ de festivitatib

B. M. V. cum solemnitate pro re gravi, et concursu populi. Quæritur: An, quando celebratur Missa, de Annunciatione modo dicto sit faciendum ad *Incarnatus*, quod fit in ipsa die Annunciationis? Resp. Ad. viii: Missas proprias de festivitatibus B. M. V. non esse celebrandas, nisi diebus, in quibus dictæ solemnitates occurrunt, et per eorum octavas, quas habent; cæteris temporibus earum loco celebrandam unam ex votivis B. M. V. in fine Missalis positis, juxta distributionem temporis in eo factam, cum iptentione ad honorem Annunciationis, Assumptiouis, etc". **573.**

2903. *Ord. Min. Capuc.*, 30 Sept., 1679. IX. "Solent Capuccini Sacerdotes in die Cœnæ Domini Sanctum Corpus Christi sumentes, deferre stolam ante pectus in formam Crucis accommodatam; quæritur, an debeant observare consuetudinem introductam, vel deferre stolam a collo pendentem? Resp. Ad ix: Posse utrumque observari". **676.**

3025. *Albinganen.*, 24 Jul., 1683. II. "Utrum in Missa *de Requiem* conveniat Communionem fidelibus ministrare, vel post illam, et in casu convenientis administrationis post Missam cum paramentis nigris, conveniat dari benedictionem, an vero benedictio omittenda? Resp.: Ad ii. Non esse contra ritum, si tamen administretur communio post Missam, omittendam esse benedictionem". **727.**

3392. *Augustæ Prætoriæ*, 21 Jul., 1696. "Cum Episcopus Augustanus S. R. C. exposuerit: III. Quod SSmum. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum continuo retinetur in eadem Ecclesia super duplici altari, nimirum super altare chori, et super alio S. Joannis Baptistæ ratione parochiæ eidem cathedrali unitæ. Resp. ad iii.: Sacratissimam Eucharistiam servandam esse in uno tantum altari designando ab Episcopo". **614.**

3525. *Ord. Capuc.*, 22 Aug., 1699. "Exposito humiliter S. R. C. per Procuratorem generalem Ordinis Capuccinorum in nonnullis provinciis, in quibus chori Ecclesiarum suæ religionis, supra valvas earumdem Ecclesiarum diametraliter altari SSmæ. Eucharistiæ oppositas existunt, consuetudinem obrepaisse in iisdem choris tempore nocturno, tam ad lumine afficiendum altare SSmi. Sacramenti, quam dormitorium, unicam lampadem in arcellula ex tela constructa retinendi, ex qua quidem situatione lampadis, cum ex maxima distantia chori ab altari SSmi. Sacramenti, hoc nihil, vel pauxillum lumen recipiat, S. R. C. supplicavit declarari: An in Ecclesiis suæ religionis prædictis, juxta recensitam consuetudinem, retentio lampadis ante altare SSmi. Sacramenti nocturno tempore, modo superius expresso sufficiat, vel potius sit retinenda lampas intra, et ante altare SSmi. Sacramenti semper accensa, prout de die retinetur? Et eadem S. R. C. respondit: Negative, et omnino lampadem esse retinendam intra, et ante altare SSmi. Sacramenti, ut continuo ardeat". **615.**

3575. *Cong. Mont. Coronæ.*, 22 Jan., 1701. X. "An ante ostiolum tabernaculi SSmi. Sacramenti, retineri possit vas florum, vel quid simile, quod prædictum occupet ostiolum cum imagine Dni. N. in eodem insculpta? XI. An in Missa *de Requiem* sacram liceat administrare Eucharistiam? Resp.: Ad. x. Negative. Posse tamen in

humiliori, et decentiori loco. Ad. xi. Omnino negative". 609, 706.

8614. *Lerien.*, 11 Feb., 1702. VII. "Utrum a Parocho Viaticum ad infirmos deferente, antiphona *Asperges me*, aut *Vidi aquam* tempore paschali sit recitanda, et ab ipso quoque ad Ecclesiam redito, dicenda oratio *Deus qui nobis*, aut *Spiritum nobis, Domine*, etc? Resp. Ad. vii.: Servandum esse omnino Rituale, nulla habita ratione temporis paschalis". 810.

8670. *Urbis et Orbis.* 10 Dec., 1706. VI. An benedictiones mulierum post partum, Fontis Baptismalis, ignis, seminis, ovorum et similium sint de juribus mere parochialibus? Resp. Ad. vi.: Negative, sed Benedictiones Mulierum et Fontis Baptismalis fieri debere a Parochis. 563.

8838. *Ord. Capuc. Prov. Lugd.*, 21 Mar., 1711. IV. "An decretum, quo prohibetur dare Communionem in Missis pro defunctis debeat ita intelligi, ut sacerdos celebrans tales Missas, in quacumque occasione, nequeat absolute Communionem dare, scilicet nec tempore celebrationis, ante post-communionem, nec post celebrationem, finito scilicet Evangelio S. Joannis? Resp. Ad iv. Negative in omnibus. 10 Jun., 1710".

"Verum sub die 21 Martii, 1711. Reproposito quarto dubio, nempe: An decretum, etc. Eadem S. R. C. respondendum censuit. Dilata et ad mentem, et mens fuit ut resolutio ad iv. edita, 21 Julii, 1710, non extra detur". 706.

8884. *Catanien.*, 9 Mar., 1711. III. "An canonicus post sumptionem Corporis et Sanguinis, dispensatione Corpus Christi clericis qualibet prima Dominica mensis (ut moris est), debeant canonici stare, an vero genuflecti, ut observatum est? Resp. Ad. iii.: Affirmative". 722.

4055. *Toletana*, 15 Sept., 1736. VIII. "An possit tolerari conversio super humerum sinistrum, communicando moniales habentes fenestellam in parte evangelii? Resp. Ad viii.: Debere descendere, et reverti per gradus anteriores, et non laterales altaris". 673.

4119. *Aquen.*, 2 Sept., 1741. IV. "Possuntne in Missa *de Requiem* consecrari hostiæ infra eam distribuendæ? Resp. Ad iv.: In missis defunctorum seu, ut utar verbis decreti, in paramentis nigris, non ministratur Eucharistia per modum sacramenti, extrahendo pyxidem a custodia, potest tamen ministrari per modum sacrificii, prout est quando fidelibus præbetur communio cum particulis infra eamdem Missam consecratis". 706.

4170. *Lucana*, 15 Maii, 1745. "An sit laudandus Parochus, qui in feria vi. in Parasceve, dum defert SS. Sacramentum ad domum sui parochiani infirmi pro ministrando ei Viatico, per vias publicas recitat consuetos psalmos, sed in fine illorum omittit *Gloria Patri*, et ingressus Ecclesiam, statim reponit sacram pyxidem, et dimittit populum absque benedictione? Et S. R. C. audito prius voto unius ex Apostolicarum cæremoniarum magistris, rescribendum censuit: Non est reprobandus Parochus, qui defert SS. Viaticum infirmo feria vi. in Parasceve, dummodo private, et submissa, quinimo submississima voce recitet psalmos consuetos per vias publicas, etiamsi dicat *Gloria Patri*, etc., quia in tali circumstantia, actio talis nihil habet esse cum

functionibus Ecclesiæ hujus diei; et considerandum est quod defert cum stola et pluviali albi coloris, quando in feria supradicta color paramentorum est niger pro Ecclesiæ functionibus: Ideoque, si defert privatim pro aliqua necessitate, non est reprobandus, si populum sine benedictione dimittat feria vi. in Parasceve, quia in publica Ecclesia non debet recondi". **799, 839.**

4252 *Lucana*, 12 April, 1755. III. "An fas sit Parochis uti in collatione Sacramenti Baptismatis Aqua in Ecclesia Matrice aut Plebanali benedicta cui privatim et separatim et non ipso actu Benedictionis Baptismalis infusa fuerint olea sacra? Resp. Ad iii.: Parochi ex matricis fonte aquam, cui sacra olea jam fuerint commixta suscipere debent, quam adhibeant in Baptismi collatione. Qui vero ante fontis benedictionem, olea sacra recipere non potuerunt, illa subinde privatim, ac separatim in aquam mittere poterunt". **253.**

4290. *Calagur. et Calceat.*, 17 Maii, 1760. Indulta a S. R. C., die 7 Julii, 1759. "Rmo. Episcopo Calagur. et Calceat., facultate subdelegandi ejus Vicarios aliosque sacerdotes pro benedictione sacræ supellectilis, in qua sacra unctio non adhibetur; dubitatum fuit ab eodem Rmo Epis. An illi quibus dicta facultas delegata fuit, benedicere possint imagines Domini Nostri J. C.... Tabernaculum in quo asservatur SS. Euch. Sacramentum, Pyxidem, et generaliter omne illud, in qno sacra unctio non adhibetur? Propterea idem Rmus. Episc. iterum S. R C. supplicavit quatenus ad omnem scrupulum amovendum, declarare dignetur. An in indulto jam sibi concesso comprehenderetur facultas subdelegandi prædictarum rerum benedictionem? Sin minus nova facultas ad hunc effectum sibi necessaria concederetur. Et S. C. eidem Rmo. Epis. indulsit "per viam novæ declarationis eandem facultatem subdelegandi benedictionem omnium quorumcumque ad Divinum Cultum spectantium in quibus sacra unctio non adhibetur". **602.**

4299. *Aquen.*, 3 Mar., 1761. VII. "Extatne aliquod decretum prohibens ne in benedictione SSmi. Sacramenti ante orationem dicatur: *Dominus vobiscum*? Asserunt multi: Rituale tamen etiam nuper a Benedicto XIV. editum id præscribit in festivitate Corporis Christi post reditum processionis. Resp. Ad. vii.: In Benedictione SSmi. Sacramenti ante orationem, non debet dici *Dominus vobiscum*, juxta decretum S. R. C. in Granaten., 16 Junii, 1663, et in Salernitana 28 Septemb., 1675, quod ita se habet: In festo SSmi. Corporis Christi servanda est dispositio Cæremonialis Episcoporum, lib. 2, cap. 33, de reponendo SSmo. Sacramento, ubi nulla fit mentio de ℣. *Dominus vobiscum*, non vero Rituale Romanum, ubi dicitur addi *Dominus vobiscum:* et sic servat in urbe Summus Pontifex, et servatur ab omnibus". **695.**

4379. *Ord. Min. Observ.*, 25 Feb., 1777. "An Diaconus in ordine tantum diaconatus constitutus, extra casum necessitatis, possit distribuere fidelibus communionem? Resp.: Negative". **647.**

4401. *Ord. Carm. Excalc.*, 16 Feb., 1781. VII. "Utrum sub prohibitione celebrandi Missas privatas post solemnem decantatam, et administrandi fidelibus

sacram Eucharistiam in nocte Nativitatis, comprehendantur Carmelitæ utriusque sexus, maxime cum apud illos cantetur Missa solemnis non in media nocte (hoc enim tempore incipit matutinum), sed circiter horam tertiam? Et quatenus Affirmative, VIII. An consuetudo contraria immemorabilis valeat sustentari saltem quoad moniales, religiosos, choristas, et laicos? Resp. Ad vii. Affirmative. Ad viii. Negative". 710.

4477. *Romana*, 16 Sept., 1801. I. "An in Ecclesiis in quibus expositum manet SS. Sacramentum fidelium adorationi in turno perpetuæ adorationis, quæ dicitur quadraginta horarum, occurrente die Commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum, liceat recitare officium defunctorum, et celebrare Missam solemnem, et etiam Missas privatas itidem defunctorum? II. Et quatenus affirmative. An adhiberi debeant paramenta coloris violacei potius quam coloris nigri? III. An in eodem casu excipiendum sit altare, in quo habetur expositum SS. Sacramentum? Resp. Ad i. Affirmative. Ad ii. Arbitrio Superioris localis. Ad iii. Affirmative". 708.

4499. *Tiphernen.*, 22nd Mar., 1806. "Cum sacerdos I. B. Berni, recenter Archipresbyteratu Ecclesiæ Parochialis, titulo SS. Cosmæ et Damiani. Diœces. Tiphernen. potitus, antiquam consuetudinem in eadem Ecclesia invenerit Sacrosanctam Eucharistiam impertiendi fidelibus in Sabbato Sancto pro satisfactione etiam Paschalis præcepti, et anceps hæserit: Num eadem consuetudo servanda foret, sive utpote abusiva removenda? Ut omnem anxietatem deponeret, supplex fuit apud S. R. C. pro declaratione sequentis dubii; videlicet: An liceat in Sabbato Sancto inter Missarum solemnia sacram Eucharistiam fidelibus distribuere, et num per eamdem sumptionem sacræ Communionis præceptum Paschale adimpleatur? Resp. Affirmative in utroque". 712.

4505. *Toletana*, 20 Sept. 1806. II. "In Ecclesia Regalis Monasterii S. Laurentii Excurialensis adest in Altari majore Tabernaculum ex lapide pretioso, in quo continetur alia capsula eximior, in qua asservatur SSmum. Sacramentum, sed cum in pariete post Tabernaculum sit una fenestra, quæ illuminat duo Tabernacula prædicta, et ista habeant ante et retro fenestellas cum cristallo taliter, quod ex qualibet parte Ecclesiæ videatur clare et distincte vas in quo est inclusum SSmum. Sacramentum; et cum hoc videatur inconveniens, quæritur. Utrum prædictum vas debeat permanere ut dictum est supra, vel debeat cooperiri aliquo velo ut non videatur? Resp. Ad ii. Negative ad primam partem. Affirmative ad secundam, atque ita obtegendum esse Tabernaculum, ut vas in quo SS. Sacramentum asservatur, a circumstantibus nullo modo videri possit". 609.

4526. *Tuden.*, 7 Sept., 1816. XXXVII. "An die magni concursus ad indulgentiam plenariam vel jubilæum, possit ministrari sacra Eucharistia fidelibus aliqua hora ante auroram, et post meridiem? Resp. ad XXXVII. In casu de quo agitur, Affirmative a tempore ad tempus quo in illa Ecclesia Missæ celebrantur, vel ad formam rubricæ, vel ad formam indulti eidem Ecclesiæ concessi". 703.

4536. *Dub. Addit.* 31 Maii, 1817.

I. "An Canonici Cathedralis in administratione Sacramentorum tam intra quam extra Cathedralem Ecclesiam teneantur deponere cappam, atque uti superpelliceo et stola juxta Rituale Romanum? Resp. Ad i. Affirmative". **121.**

4572. *Calagur. et Calceat.*, 23 Sept., 1820. "Parochus in casu necessitatis periclitantem puerum stola violacea indutus domi baptizavit, eique sacrum chrisma et oleum sacrum quod secum detulit, imposuit, prout in Rit. Romano. Quæritur an bene, vel male se gesserit in casu unctionis extra Ecclesiam? Et S. R. C. . . . . respondendum censuit: Juxta votum, nimirum parochum male se gessisse, baptizando cum stola violacea, et liniendo puerum periclitantem, extra Ecclesiam, oleo etiam catechumenorum. In casu enim necessitatis, juxta Ritualis præscriptum, omnia sunt omittenda quæ baptismum præcedunt, quæque post modum supplenda sunt in Ecclesia, ad quam præsentandus est puer cum convalescit". **382.**

4578. *Decretum generale*, 3 Ap. 1821. VI. "An toleranda, vel eliminanda sit consuetudo, quæ in dies invalescit, superimponendi sacras reliquias, pictasque imagines tabernaculo, in quo Augustissimum Sacramentum asservatur, ita ut idem tabernaculum pro basi inserviat? Resp. Ad vi. Assertam consuetudinem tanquam abusum eliminandam omnino esse". **607.**

4594. *Panormit.*, 12 Ap., 1823. IX. "Quæstio sæpe exorta est, utrum in Missa *de Requiem* cum paramentis nigris celebrata, post communionem celebrantis, administrari possit fidelibus adstantibus Eucharistia cum particulis præconsecratis, asserentibus nonnullis posse: 1° Quia in operibus Ferdinandi Tetami decretum S. C. die 2 Sept., 1741, tamquam apocryphum habendum esse dicitur. 2° Quia affirmativum fuit responsum Josephi Dini apostolicarum cæremoniarum magistri, sententiæ innixi Benedicti XIV., in suo opere *De Sacrificio Missæ*: ut autem omnis hac de re tollatur scrupulus quæsitum fuit: An pro certa tenenda sit sententia affirmativa Benedicti XIV. et Tetami, vel supradictum decretum sub die 2 Sept., 1741? Resp. Ad ix.: Dilata, et videatur particulariter ex officio". **85, 707.**

4623. *Gandaven.*, 16 Dec., 1826. I. "Facti species—Rector Ecclesiæ reperit in sua Ecclesia consuetudinem renovandi panem pro sacrificio Missæ, et communione fidelium, singulis tribus mensibus tempore hyemis, tempore vero æstivo, solitum confici pro sex mensibus. Hinc quæritur: 1° An, attenta consuetudine, rector licite consecrare possit species a tribus mensibus tempore hyemis, vel a sex mensibus in æstate confectas? 2° An casu, quo rector, sive pastor Ecclesiæ praxim illam approbet, nec velit eam relinquere, alii sacerdotes in eadem Ecclesia inservientes possint tuta conscientia in hoc ei obsecundare, utendo præfatis speciebus? II. Facti species—In Parochiis ruralibus, ubi longum faciendum est iter, plerumque portatur SSmum. Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ad ægrotos, eisque administratur cum stola super vestem communem absque cotta, sive superpelliceo. Quæritur propterea. 1. An praxis illa ubi invaluit, et Ordinarii locorum non contradicunt, retineri possit? 2.

An saltem Sacramentum Extremæ Unctionis cum stola tantum administrari possit? III. Facti species—Sacerdotes curam animarum exercentes, pro sua commoditate, apud se in domibus suis retinent Sanctum Oleum infirmorum. Quæritur: An, attenta consuetudine, hanc praxim licite retinere valeant? IV. Facti species—Sacra Olea, in Cœna Domini benedicta, transmittuntur ad decanos foraneos, qui ea distribuant pastoribus suorum districtuum: Quæritur, an decani distributionem differre possint usque post Dominicam in Albis? V. Facti species—Multi pastores accepta Sacra Olea apud se deponunt in domibus suis, usque in sequentem diem Dominicam; et tunc cum solemni processione, videlicet cum cruce, cum candelis ardentibus sub baldachino a toto clero in habitu, portantur ad ecclesiam, exponunturque in aliquo altari cum hymnis, et eadem solemnitate portantur ad fontem baptismalem eique infunduntur: Quæritur 1° An pastores recte retineant Sacra Olea in domibus suis, usque in dominicam receptionem eorum subsequentem? 2° An Sacra Olea cum tali solemnitate introduci possint in ecclesiam? 3° An cum tali solemnitate infundi possint fonti baptismali, cui non potuerunt infundi in vigilia Paschatis, cum tunc necdum haberi potuissent? Tandem Quæritur An benedictio cum indulgentia plenaria, juxta Constitutionem Benedicti XIV. *Pia Mater, 5 Aprilis*, 1747, impertienda sit pueris qui, defectu ætatis, primam communionem necdum instituerunt? Resp. Ad. I, Quæs. I.—Negative et eliminata consuetudine servetur Rubrica. Ad 2—Negative. Ad 1 Quæs. ii.—Negative et eliminata consuetudine servetur Ritualis Romani præscriptum. Ad 2. ejusdem Quæs—Negative ut ad proximum. Ad dub. unic. Quæs. iii.—Negative, et servetur Rituale Romanum, excepto tamen casu magnæ distantiæ ab Ecclesia; quo in casu omnino servetur etiam domi, rubrica quoad honestam et decentem, tutamque custodiam. Ad dub. unic. Quæs. iv.—Negative. Ad 1 Quæs. v.—Jam provisum in responsione ad Quæs. iii. Ad 2 ejusdem Quæs.—Tollendam esse inductam consuetudinem, et servandas Ritualis Rubricas. Ad 3 ejusdem—Jam provisum in precedenti. Ad postremum—Affirmative". **251, 267, 621, 798, 855, 918, 961.**

4651. *Florentin.*, 19 Dec., 1839. I. "An tempore SS. Missæ sacrificii in administratione Viatici præsertim in Xenodochiis, licet ab Altare recedere usque ad ægrotorum lectum recitando interim psalmum *Miserere*, ut fieri solet extra Missam? II. Utrum tempore etiam sacrificii Missæ administrari possit SSmum. Viaticum in paramentis nigris? Resp. Ad i.: Negative, quoad psalmum *Miserere* recitandum; insuper animadvertendum, quod si Celebrans pro Viatici administratione *intra Missam*, altare e conspectu suo amittat, hanc administrationem non licere". Ad ii.: Affirmative. **840.**

4677. *Tarentina*, 12 Nov., 1831. "Ex pio quodam legato tenentur moniales ordinis S. Claræ in propria Ecclesia ad altare majus, publicæ fidelium venerationi SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum exponere tribus postremis diebus carnis prævii. Ne vero in sacro

audiendo ipsarum pietas fraudetur, humillimas S. R. C preces porrexerunt, pro facultate celebrandi Missam conventualem sine cantu ad altare ubi expositio, ut supra, peragitur dictis tribus diebus. Resp.: Pro gratia, dummodo sacra Eucharistia in Missa non distribuatur". **670.**

4685. *Massæ, et Popul.*, 7 Ap., 1832. "An servandum sit Rituale Romanum, seu potius consuetudo benedicendi nimirum cum SS. retrocedentem populum extra portas civitatis, regionis, sive domus infirmi, quando fertur viaticum agrariis? Resp.: Ex speciali gratia servari posse consuetudinem". **833.**

4707. *Veronen*, 16 Mar, 1833. "I. Utrum tuto sequi valeat regula Ritualis Parisiensis sic expressa: Si quando Communio danda est, inventus non fuerit sufficiens numerus hostiarum, poterunt aliquot hostiæ dividi in plures particulas, quæ singulis distribuantur: Et quatenus non sit sequenda, utrum quibusdam saltem in circumstantiis, temporis, locorum, et personæ sequi possit? VI. Utrum in Communione fidelium extra missam, sacerdos antequam populo benedicat, osculari debeat altare ut præcipit Pontificale Rom. de visitatione, vel non, ut Rituale Romanum innuere videtur? Resp. Ad. i.—Servetur consuetudo dividendi consecratas particulas, si adsit necessitas. Ad vi.—Servetur dispositio Ritualis Romani nihil præscribentis". **691, 700.**

4748. *Ord. Min. Capuccin.*, 28 Maii, 1835. "I. An consuetudo benedicendi populum cum sacra Pyxide quoties Eucharistia distribuitur, sit servanda vel potius an benedicendus sit populus manu dextra tantum, uti habetur in Rituali Romano, et in una Urbinaten., 16 Jan., 1793? II. Et quatenus affirmative ad primam partem an tunc dicendum sit: *Benedicat vos*, etc.? V. An consuetudo dicendi in Communione Fidelium: *Ecce Agnus Dei*, et *Domine non sum dignus* idiomate vulgari, sit sustinenda, vel potius eliminanda utpote contraria Rituali et Missali Romano? Resp. Ad i.—Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam, juxta Rituale Romanum, et Decret. Urbinaten. die 16 Jan., 1793. Ad ii.—Provisum in primo. Ad v.—Consuetudinem esse eliminandam". **672.**

4753. *Veronen.*, 23 Maii, 1835. "Quum diversæ circumferantur opiniones circa Communionem Fidelibus administrandam in missis defunctorum. RR. Veronensis Episcopus pastoralis sui muneris esse censuit hanc S. R. C. adire eidemque humillimis datis precibus supplicare ut declarare dignaretur an in prædicta missa *de Requiem.* cum paramentis nigris, liceat unquam S. synaxim administrare cum particulis præconsecratis? EE. et RR. PP. perpendentes alias sancitum fuisse in iisdem Missis defunctorum seu in paramentis nigris, ministrandam non esse Eucharistiam per modum sacramenti, extrahendo pyxidem a custodia, ac posse tantum ministrari per modum sacrificii, cum Particulis intra eamdem Missam consecratis, proposito dubio rescribendum censuerunt: Negative, juxta decreta 22 Jan. 1701, 22 Nov. 1710, et 2 Sept. 1741". **707.**

4777. *Trident.*, 12 Mar., 1836. XII. "An toleranda sit, vel eliminanda consuetudo inveterata, sacerdotem, qui ad altare aliquod

ad celebrandum accedit, vel ab eo recedit. sic sacris vestibus sacrificii indutum, et jam præ manibus calicem tenentem, ascendere in transitu altare, in quo adest SSma. Eucharistia, ut ibi sacram Communionem fidelibus distribuat? Et quatenus non sit toleranda, utrum depositis planeta, et manipulo in sacristia, accedere possit cum alba, et stola? XIII An stola, pro ministranda sanctissima Eucharistia extra Missam, semper esse debeat coloris officio illius diei convenientis, ut præscribit Rituale Romanum, vel potius esse debeat alba prout valde conveniens Sacramento Eucharistiæ, ut multi censent doctores? Resp. ad xii. Si adsit necessitas posse tolerari. Ad xiii. Juxta Ritualis Romani rubricam, debet esse coloris officio convenientis". **69, 658, 729.**

4780. *Rhedonen.*, 27 Aug., 1836. I. " Utra pedum pars superior ne an inferior ungenda sit in Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis? III. Quænam servari debent cæremoniæ, et preces quæ supplendæ sunt adulto catholico valide post nativitatem baptizato, sed omissis cæremoniis, quæ juxta Rituale baptismum præcedere vel sequi debent: An illæ, quæ in Rituali assignantur pro baptismo adultorum, vel quæ pro baptismo infantium? IV. Quæ ex his cæremoniis servari debent, quum adultus ab hæresi ad fidem catholicam conversus baptizandus est sub conditione, ob dubium fundatum de validitate baptismi a ministro hæretico collati? Resp ad i. Nihil innovandum. Ad iii. Cæremoniæ et preces servantur, quæ in Rituali assignantur pro baptismo infantium. Ad iv. Quatenus supplendæ sint, et supplendæ credantur cæremoniæ, ut in dubio, illæ supplendæ sunt, quæ pro adultorum baptismo sunt præscriptæ". **459, 534, 937.**

4815. *Mutinen.*, 23 Sept., 1837. II. " Quum orationes tam præcedentes quam subsequentes communionem Missæ Sabbati Sancti loquantur in numero plurali: hinc quæritur, utrum liceat in eadem Missa post Communionem celebrantis, Eucharistiam ministrare fidelibus, et præsertim cum particulis in eadem Missa consecratis? III. Perdurat adhuc in quibusdam Ecclesiis mos communicandi in Missa defunctorum cum particulis præconsecratis, propterea quod Decreta Sacræ Congregationis hac super re edita non censentur a multis authentica, aut saltem revocata. Hinc quæritur 1° An idem mos possit permitti vel saltem ab Episcopo prohibendus, adeo ut solum liceat communicare in dictis Missis, cum particulis in ipsis consecratis? 2° An saltem toleranda consuetudo celebrandi prædictas Missas in paramentis violaceis, ad hoc ut possit præberi sacra Communio cum particulis præconsecratis? Resp. ad ii. Negative, nisi adsit consuetudo. Ad iii. Quoad 1. Dilata et servetur Rescriptum in Panormitana diei 12 Aprilis, 1823, ad Dub. 9. Quoad 2. Serventur rubricæ". **707, 708, 712.**

4820. *Oriolen*, 23 Sept., 1837. " Perdurantibus belli civilis calamitatibus in Regno Hispaniarum, accidit ut Reverendissimus Oriolen. Episcopus, superiori anno 1836, olea sacra, feria quinta in Cœna Domini, consecrare nequiverit pro solemni benedictione Fontium Baptismalium parochialibus in ecclesiis peragenda in sequente Sabbato Sancto, neque eadem olea a vicinioribus Episco-

pis parochi habere potuerint, siquidem ob communia incommoda, pene omnes episcopales sedes proprio sunt viduatæ pastore, ita ut communicationibus interceptis, grex a pastore, filius a parente, Ecclesia ab Episcopis, non sine magno animarum salutis detrimento separentur. Hujusmodi in angustiis constituti, parochi præbendati Oriolen. Diœcesis diversas inter se protulere sententias, et nonnullis negantibus bene multi opinabantur benedictionem solemnem Fontium Baptismalium perfici posse, adhibitis oleis superiori anno consecratis. In qua opinionum et sententiarum varietate, id sumpsere consilii, ut Sacram hanc Rituum Congregationem requirerent, ut certam sequerentur regulam in re tanti momenti, ac propterea sequentia dubia enodanda humillime proposuerunt, nimirum: I. An talis Benedictio (Fontis Baptismalis in Sabbato Sancto) fieri debeat cum chrismate et oleo præcedentis anni, an potius omittenda sit infusio chrismatis et olei, usque dum accipiantur recenter consecrata? II. An in baptismo solemni infantium utendum sit hujusmodi aqua, benedicta quidem cum reliquis cæremoniis Missalis, sed absque consecratione seu mixtione sacrorum chrismatis et olei: an vero aqua consecrata præcedenti anno, quæ ad hunc finem conservetur? III. An supposito quod aqua baptismalis benedicta sit cum veteribus oleis, eo quod recenter consecrata non haceantur, infundi debeat in piscinam, simul ac nova recipiuntur olea, et iterum cum his alia benedicenda sit aqua juxta cæremonias Ritualis Romani: an vero illa conservari et uti debeat, usque ad benedictionem in vigilia Pentecostes prout in Missali? IV. An in baptismo solemni, ungendi sunt infantes oleo et chrismate præcedentis anni, dum recenter consecrata non habenter; an vero omittenda hæc sit cæremonia, et postea supplenda quum novum oleum et novum chrisma recipiantur? S. R. C. rescripsit: Ad i. Affirmative ad primam partem, Negative ad secundam. Ad ii. Negative ad utrumque, sed fieri debet nova fontis benedictio cum oleis anni precedentis, seu provisum in prima parte superioris dubii. Ad iii. Negative ad primam partem. Affirmative ad secundam Ad iv.—Affirmative ad primam partem. Negative, ad secundum". **253, 255.**

4947. *Tertii Ord. Sti. Francisci*, 24 Sept, 1842. III. "An in Communione fidelibus ministranda, post versum, *Panem de cælo*, etc., dici omnino debeant ante orationem alii versus, *Domine exaudi*, et *Dominus vobiscum*? Resp. Ad iii.—Affirmative, ut prescribitur in Rituali Romano". **695. 827.**

4950. *Neapol.*, 24 Sept., 1842. "I. An sacerdos seipsum signans cum hostia, et calice consecratis, ante sumptionem Sanctissimi Sacramenti ad verba,—*Jesu Christi*, —debeat caput inclinare? III. An Sacerdos pergens ad explendam communionem extra missam debeat per se, vel per ministrum deferre bursam, in qua corporale recludetur? Resp. Ad i.—Affirmative, juxta Rubricas. Ad iii. —Decere ut a Sacerdote deferatur" **661, 685.**

5010. *Patavina*, 7 Dec., 1844. "IV. An præter casum a Rituali Romano prævisum. *Tit. De Sacram. Ext. Unct.* in quo de Sacro Oleo adhibendo in hoc Sacramento hæc habentur—'Id tamen si forte

intra annum aliquo modo ita deficiat, ut sufficere non posse videatur, neque aliud benedictum haberi queat, modico oleo non benedicto, in minori quantitate superinfuso reparari potest', liceat unquam Sacris Oleis Feria V. in Cœna Domini benedictis aliam Olei non benedicti quantitatem addere? An hæc additio saltem fieri possit eadem Feria V. in Cœna Domini, adeo ut pars tantum Olei subjiciatur benedictioni et immediate misceatur cum Oleo non benedicto? Resp. Ad iv.—Negative, sed in casu tantum necessitatis fieri potest additio uti in Rituali præscribitur". 258.

5036. *Bisinianen.*, 23 Maii, 1846. "Quum ea sit positio Parochialis Ecclesiæ Acri in Diœcesi Bisinianen. ut ad Fideles ut plurimum per agros dissitos ac ad plura milliaria distentos, Sacrum Viaticum, dum ipsi infirmantur deferri nequeat nisi summa cum difficultate ob viarum asperitatem, ac ventorum, nivium, glacierumque incommoda, inde fit ut animarum dispendia necessario eveniant, et semper majora timeri debeant. Queis incommodis occurrere, quoad fieri potest, exoptantes hodierni Parochus et Œconomi oppidi ipsius invectæ in enunciata parœcia consuetudini hujusmodi in casibus deferendi SSmum. Sacramentum capite pileo cooperto, et equitando, amplius se conformare formidant quia nulla usque nunc intercessit Apostolica venia. S. R. C. proinde enixis precibus adeuntes consuetudinis ipsius confirmationem instanter rogarunt, quod et ipse Rmus. Episcopus pro informatione et voto requisitus efflagitat, ex propria notione in sacra visitatione quæ enunciantur incommoda expertus. Et S. C., omnibus perpensis, rescribendum censuit 'Detur decretum in Laudata, die 23 Jan., 1740', nimirum committit Rmo. Episcopo ut pro suo arbitrio et prudentia indulgeat, quod deinceps hujusmodi in circumstantiis equitantes ac capite pileo cooperto sacrum viaticum deferre valeant, comitante saltem uno homine, si fieri potest, accensam laternam deferente". 890.

5068. *Cong. Cler. Regul. Ss. Crucis*, 27 Feb., 1847. "I. An semper adhibenda sit bursa cum corporali, supra quod reponenda sit sacra pyxis, toties quoties administratur Communio Christifidelibus extra Missam, uti innuitur in Ritualis Romani rubrica, et clare docetur a Gavanto aliisque sacrorum rituum expositoribus? II. An Rituale Romanum prout in casu, intelligendum sit, quod assumi debeat bursa cum corporali tantum quando Sacrum Viaticum defertur ad infirmos, an toties quoties extra Missam Sacra præbetur Synaxis? III. An Rubrica Ritualis Romani sit, prout in casu, præceptiva, vel tantum directiva, et ad libitum? Resp. Ad i.—Affirmative juxta Rituale. Ad II. In administranda Eucharistia intelligendum. Ad iii. Præceptivam esse". 661, 809.

5102. *Angelop.*, 11 Sept., 1847. XVI. "An Decreta Sac. Rituum Congregationis, dum eduntur, derogent cuicumque contrariæ invectæ consuetudini etiam immemorabili, et in casu affirmative obligent etiam quoad conscientiam? Resp. Ad xvi.: Affirmative, sed recurrendum in particulari". 40.

5132. *Ord. Carm.*, 22 Jul., 1848. V. "An Ecclesia parochialis omnino adigatur ad functiones Sab-

bati Sancti, juxta parvum Cæremoniale Sa. Me. Benedicti XIII., si sufficienti clero destituatur; et an hujusmodi in casu Missa ordinanda sit, ut in præcedentibus dubiis tertio et quarto? Resp.: Ad v.—Affirmative, et servetur in omnibus solitum, juxta parvum Cæremoniale Benedicti Papæ XIII.". **251.**

5165. *Cenomanen.*, 10 Jan, 1852. "IV. Etiamsi Ecclesia Cenomanensis sibi de Breviario et Missali iterum atque iterum, ut libuerit, providere queat, an istiusmodi facultas extendenda sit ad Pontificale, Cæremoniale Episcoporum, Martyrologium, et Rituale Romanum, ita videlicet ut præceptivas prædictorum librorum regulas, tolerante nempe aut permittente, aut etiam aliter quidpiam statuente Revmo. Episcopo, canonici, aliive sacerdotes possint illæsa conscientia infringere aut omittere, atque Reverendissimi Episcopi voluntas his in casibus sit pro ipsis sufficiens dispensatio? V. Utrum possint et ipsi canonici qui, ex antiquo more, mozetta et rochetto insigniti sunt, uti rochetto in administratione, seu confectione sacramentorum et sacramentalium, quum Reverendissimus Episcopus usum rochetti generaliter, et pro majori seminario, recenter præceperit, seu saltem probaverit, et pro omnibus insuper suæ diœcesis presbyteris, etiam in sacramentorum administratione, se toleraturum esse voce et scripto declaraverit, quidquid in contrarium faciant Cæremoniale Episcoporum, Rituale Romanum, Missale et Pontificale, licetque nulla in diœcesi Cenomanensi antiqua, aut usque dum generalis pro ea sacræ liturgiæ derogatione exstiterit consuetudo? Resp. Ad iv.—Negative et amplius. Ad v.—Rochettum non esse vestem sacram adhibendam in administratione sacramentorum, ac proinde tum ad ea administranda, tum ad suscipiendam primam tonsuram, et minores ordines necessario superpelliceo utendum". **71, 121.**

5183. *Ord. Min. Sti. Francisci*, 16 April, 1853. "XXIV. Possunt ne in Missa post sumptionem haberi breves sermones, dum vel ad Sacram Synaxim prima vice adolescentes admittuntur, vel alia quacumque ex causa, qui quidem sermones *Fervorini* nuncupantur? Resp. Ad xxiv.—Affirmative". **672.**

5186. *Grossetan*, 7 Maii, 1853. "III. Utrum formula illa, quæ in Pontificali Romano adhibenda edicitur dum ordinatis SS. Eucharistiam administrat Episcopus ordinans, adhiberi possit ab Episcopo quotiescumque fidelibus Eucharistiam administrat, seu an extra communionem ordinatorum adhibere debeat communem formulam, prout jacet in Rituali Romano? Resp. Ad iii.—Formulam in Pontificali præscriptam dum ad Sacram Synaxim Episcopus ordinatos admittit extra casum illum non esse adhibendam; seu quoad primam, Negative—quoad secundam, Affirmative. **684.**

5188. *Cochin.*, 9 Jun., 1853. "II. Plures Theologi, inter quos S. Alphonsus Maria de Ligorio, sentiunt veniale esse omittere vocem *Amen* in fine formæ Baptismi, quæ tamen vox non reperitur in Rituali Romano: quæritur ergo utrum adhibenda sit vel omittenda? Resp. Ad ii.—Strictim in casu servetur Rituale Romanum". **168.**

5202. *Romana*, 8 Ap., 1854.

"I. Quum in declaratione S. R. C. lata die 23 Maii, 1846, sanscitum fuerit Decreta et Responsiones ab ipsa emanatas, dummodo scripto formiter editæ fuerint eamdem auctoritatem habere, ac si immediate ab ipso Summo Pontifice promanarent, quæritur an per verba; *dummodo formiter scripto editæ fuerint*, sufficiat quod sint subscriptæ a S. R. C. Præfecto ac secretario, ac ejusdem sigillo munitæ, seu potius requiratur, ut sint vel Romæ, vel ab Episcopis in suis diœcesibus promulgatæ? II. Et quatenus affirmative ad 1 partem, negative ad 2. An tamquam formiter editæ habendæ sint Decreta, et Responsiones in Gardelliniana authentica collectione insertæ? Et sacra eadem Congregatio, post diligens examen omnium, respondere rata est. Ad i. —Affirmative ad primam partem, Negative ad secundam. Ad ii.—Affirmative uti patet ex adjecta declaratione". **26.**

5221. *Briocen*, 21 Jul, 1855. "X. Quæritur an in administrando Viatico Sacro agrotanti Sacerdoti aliquis sit ritus specialis diversus a ritu præscripto a Rituali Romano—'De Communione Infirmorum', ut innuere videtur Cæremoniale Episcoporum, lib. ii. cap. xxxviii. n. 3 et 5, dicens 'Profiteatur *Episcopus ægrotus* Catholicam fidem, ex formula ab Apostolica Sede præscripta?' Et quatenus affirmative, utrum servari possit sequens ritus qui legitur in quodam Rituali? (*ritus describitur*). XII. Utrum Tabernaculum in quo reconditur SSmum. Sacramentum Conopeo cooperiri debeat, ut fuit Rituale, et quatenus affirmative. 2. Utrum Conopeum istud confici possit ex panno, sive grossypio sive lana, sive cannabo contexto. 3. Cujusmam coloris esse debeat? aliis opinantibus, ut Baruffaldus, Conopeum debere esse coloris albi, utpote convenientis SSmo. Sacramento, aliis autem, ut Gavantus, ejusdem coloris cujus sunt pallium Altaris et cætera paramenta pro temporis festique ratione, præter colorem nigrum, qui mutatur in colore violaceo in exequiis defunctorum. Resp. Ad x.—Negative in omnibus. Ad xii.—Quoad 1^am^ questionem, Affirmative: quoad 2^am^ pariter. Affirmative: quoad 3^am^ utramque sententiam posse in praxim deduci, maxime vero sententiam Gavanti quæ pro se habet usum Ecclesiarum urbis".

The following decrees are not found in Gardellini, though some have an earlier date than decrees given in the last edition of his work (vid. n. **253**). They are taken either from the *Decreta Authentica*, &c., by Falise, or from the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, except the last two, which are taken from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*.

Trecen., 22 Maii, 1841. "Precibus sacerdotis P. N. Parochi civitatis Bar-sur-Aube, diœcesis Trecen. quem sit expetebat sequentium dubiorum solutionem quoad usum Breviarii Romani, quod recitat ab anno 1823, nimirum: I. An non obstante prohibitione RR. Episcopi, possit tuta conscientia perseverare in recitando Breviario Romano, sicque oneri divini officii facere satis? III. An in administrandis sacramentis Rituali Romano uti queat? Resp.:

Ad i.—Sine speciali indulto non posse. Ad iii.—In casu: Affirmative". 71.

Veronen., 7 Sept., 1850. XV. "Utrum intra Missæ actionem Sabb. S. Clerus et populus possint sumere Eucharistiam? Insuper num expleta Missa possint fideles cum particulis præconsecratis, seu per modum Sacramenti communicari? Resp.: Ad xv. Negative ad primum, affirmative ad secundum" 712.

Lucionen., 12 Aug., 1854. XX. "Adsunt dispositiones Cæremonialis Episcoporum, lib. ii. cap. xxxix. n. 3, de patena a diacono tenenda sub mento communicantium, quando Communio in Missa solemni ab Episcopo administratur: adest etiam decretum diei 8 Septembris, 1661, in Adrien. declarans licitam esse patenæ suppositionem per sacerdotem cotta indutum in communione generali, quæ per dignitates agitur. Sed quæritur utrum in aliis casibus, liceat, ubi talis est consuetudo, dum celebrans ministrat sacram Communionem, patenam a diacono supponi sub mento communicantium, prout suadetur a nonnullis præclaris liturgistis Merati et Bauldry—Experientia enim ut dicunt, necessitatem hujus ritus evidenter probat.—Et revera quoties pluribus administratur sacra Communio ex particulis consecratis parva fragmenta decidunt, quæ si in linteum ante communicantes extensum cadant, in terram postea labentur dum hoc linteum movebitur per fideles successive ad sacram mensam accedentes, et præsertim quum, finita communione, aufertur linteum: itaque quum non appareant, pretiosissima fragmenta disperdentur. Ad hæc præcavenda, prælaudati auctores prædictam praxim de cujus legitimitate inquirimus, commendant. Vel potius eo tempore, quo distribuitur sacra Communio, diaconus debeat ministrare clericis purificationem, prout indicat rubrica Missalis, part ii. tit. x. n. 9? XXI. Propter eadem motiva ad præcavendum sacrorum fragmentorum perditionem, potestne sacerdos sanctam Communionem sive intra Missam, sive extra Missam administrans, tenere patenam inter digitos manus sinistræ, quæ sacram pyxidem gestat, ut eam sic mento communicantium supponat quamvis rubrica sileat de hoc ritu? XXII. Quatenus autem suppositio patenæ de qua in duobus dubiis præcedentibus agitur, non liceat quæritur quodnam medium adhiberi debeat, ut præcaveatur sacrorum fragmentorum disperditio, dum sancta Communio administratur? XXIII. Quando sacra Communio ministratur monialibus ad fenestellam clausuræ, muri crassitudo impedit quin sacerdos prope os communicantium pyxidem admovere possit ad præcavendum ne fragmenta cadant extra ipsam; licetne in hoc casu servare consuetudinem apponendi, supra linteum ante communicantes extensum, laminam argenteam deauratam, seu bacile ejusdem materiæ ad recipienda fragmenta, quæ decidere possint, et unde a sacerdote, postquam ad altare regressus fuerit, colligentur? XXIV. Purificatio post communionem de qua loquuntur rubricæ Missalis, part. ii. tit. x. n. 9, et Cæremoniale Episcoporum, lib. 2. c. xxix. n. 4, non est in usu apud nos: quæritur utrum instaurationis liturgiæ romanæ occasione in diœcesi nostra expediat hanc

praxim inducere, saltem pro communione cleri sive generali sive particulari in Missa solemni? LXIII. Utrum in vers. et resp. qui in administratione Extremæ Unctionis post unctiones factas dicuntur, et in tribus orationibus quæ sequuntur, facienda sit variatio generis quando recitantur pro muliere, dicendo ℣. *Salvam fac ancillam tuam.* Et similiter de aliis sicuti variatio generis indicatur a Rituali in ritu Benedictionis Apostolicæ in articulo mortis, et a Pontificali in confirmatione unius? LXXII. An in Missa privata dum celebrans administrat sacram Communionem, minister debeat eum comitari cum cereo accenso, sicut aliqui putant, quamvis Rubrica taceat de hoc ritu? vel quum purificationem quæ pro populi non est in usu non præbeat, nec mappam communionis utpote cancellis affixam ante communicantes sustineat, tunc debeat manere genuflexus in latere Epistolæ? LXXIII. An in Missa solemni a simplici sacerdote celebrata, dum administratur populo sacra Communio, duo Acolythi si non sustineant mappam ante communicantes, debeant comitari celebrantem cum suis candelabris, et cereis accensis; vel manere ad credentiam genuflexi, ita ut diaconus et subdiaconus tunc comitentur celebrantem? An saltem in Missa absque ministris sacris cantata Acolythi debeant assistere celebranti tempore communionis populi sive cum candelabris sive cum facibus? LXXVI. An sacerdos in fine administrationis communionis extra Missam, proferens verba: *Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis*, debeat extendere manus eodem ritu ac dum dicit in fine Missæ: *Benedicat vos Omnipotens Deus*, sicuti docent Cavalieri tom. 4, cap. 4, dec. 13, n 41, et alii, aliis contradicentibus, et Rituali hunc ritum non indicante, vel dicendo hæc verba, tenere manus junctas, et tantum inclinare caput? LXXIX. In Diœcesi Lucionensi et in aliis, multi parochi ob distantiam locorum olea sacra feria quinta in Cœna Domini benedicta tempestive habere non possunt, ut ea in benedictione fontis baptismalis Sabbato Sancto facienda, adhibeant, sed paucos post dies accipiunt. Habetur quidem decretum *diei* 23 *Sept.*, 1837. At forsan sanctio hujus decreti spectabat casum particularem, in quo versabantur diœceses Hispaniæ in quibus benedictio oleorum facta non fuerat, et nesciebatur quonam tempore accipi possent nova olea sacra. Hinc quæritur an in prædicta nostra circumstantia benedictio fontis baptismalis fieri debeat cum chrismate et oleo præcedentis anni, et sic tali casui applicanda sit responsio data in *Oriolen.*? vel potius omittenda sit tunc infusio chrismatis et olei, usque dum accipiantur recenter consecrata, prout innuere videtur decretum, die 12 Aprilis, 1755, in *Lucana*, ad iii? LXXX. Posito quod in prædicto casu benedictio fontis facienda sit cum chrismate et oleo præcedentis anni quæritur etiam utrum accepta nova olea infundi debeant in hanc aquam quæ cum infusione veterum oleorum fuit benedicta? An potius ad infundenda hæc nova olea expectandum sit usque ad aliam benedictionem fontis quæ fit in vigilia Pentecostes? Resp. Ad xx.—Quoad primam partem, licere. Quoad secundam, juxta

consuetudinem, sed purificationem etiam clericos subministrare posse. Ad xxi.—Negative. Ad xxii.—Quoad communiones solemnes provisum in xx: quoad alias curam et solertiam sacerdotis supplere debere. Ad xxiii. —Affirmative. Ad xxiv.—Provisum in xx. Ad lxiii.—Affirmative. Ad lxxii.—Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam. Ad lxxiii.—Servari posse consuetudinem laudabilem astandi cum facibus. Ad lxxvi.—Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam. Ad lxxix. —Pro diversitate circumstantiarum in praxi utrumque decretum servari posse, nam in *Lucana* supponitur quod ex aliquo fortuito casu olea sacra ad breve tempus retardentur; et in *Oriolen.* loquitur de omnimoda impossibilitate habendi olea sacra a propria cathedrali vel a vicinioribus diœcesibus. Ad lxxx.—In sensu præcedentis responsionis, Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam". **253, 650, 651, 652, 660, 700, 941.**

Molinen., 12 Sept.. 1857. X. "Utrum sacerdos in Missa, postquam se communicaverit, priusquam communionem adstantibus distribuat, possit sermonem ad populum habere? XVII. Utrum in collatione Baptismi interrogationes possint fieri vernacule, vel saltem vernacule, iterari, postquam latine factæ fuerint? Resp. Ad x.—Affirmative ab altari et de consensu ordinarii. Ad xvii.—Quoad interrogationes quæ Baptismi ordinem præcedunt vel sequuntur, ac pro quibus Rituale nullam exhibet formulam, affirmative. Quoad interrogationes quæ in ipsomet Baptismi ordine occurrunt, ac pro quibus formulæ in Rituali extant, negative ad utramque partem". **298, 672.**

Wratislavien., 18 Jun., 1859. "An possit tolerari ut præfata benedictio post partum illegitimum denegetur? Resp: Ad benedictionem post partum jus tantum habent mulieres quæ ex matrimonio legitimo pepererunt". **560.**

Plurium Diœceseum., 9 Jul., 1864. "Nonnulli Reverendissimi Galliarum Antistites serio perpendentes in multis suarum Diœceseum Ecclesiis difficile admodum et nonnisi magnis sumptibus comparari posse oleum olivarum ad nutriendam diu noctuque saltem unam lampadem ante Sanctissimum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum, ab Apostolica Sede declarari petierunt utrum in casu, attentis difficultatibus et Ecclesiarum paupertate, oleo olivarum substitui possint alea olea quæ ex vegetabilibus habentur, ipso non excluso petroleo. Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, etsi semper sollicita ut etiam in hac parte quod usque ab Ecclesiæ primordiis circa usum olei ex olivis inductum est, ob mysticas significationes retineatur; attamen silentio præterire minime censuit rationes ab iisdem Episcopis prolatas; ac proinde exquisito prius Voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Cœremoniarum Magistris, subscriptus Cardinalis Præfectus ejusdem Sacræ Congregationis rem omnem proposuit in Ordinariis Comitiis ad Vaticanum hodierna die habitis. Eminentissimi autem et Reverendissimi Patres Sacris tuendis Ritibus præpositi, omnibus accurate perpensis ac diligentissime examinatis, rescribendum censuerunt: *Generatim utendum esse oleo oli-*

varum: ubi vero haberi nequeat remittendum prudentiæ Episcoporum ut lampades nutriantur ex aliis oleis quantum fieri possit vegetabilibus". 615.

"Quum Rubricæ nec Missalis, nec Ritualis determinent numerum genuflexionum quæ a Sacerdote fieri debent dum ad altare revertitur cum Sanctissimo Sacramento post distributam Fidelibus sacram Communionem, alter ex Apostolicarum Cœremoniarum magistris, de sententia desuper requisitus, post accuratum examen censuit, regulam in casu desumendam a Rubricis determinantibus duplicem genuflexionem antequam Sacerdos Communionem ipsam administret, nimirum primam antequam extrahat a tabernaculo pyxidem, alteram vero post discoopertam super altare eamdem pyxidem. Cum enim agatur de culto debito Sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ, congruum profecta est ut eodem prorsus modo iste cultus præstetur a Sacerdote ad altare redeunte, nimirum genuflectendo primo antequam pyxidem cooperiat, et iterum postquam illam in tabernaculo recondidit, antequam tabernaculi ostiolum claudat. Hanc porro sententiam cum infrascriptus SS. Rituum Congregationis Secretarius retulerit in Ordinario coetu SS. Rituum subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunata; Eminentissimi et Reverendissimi Patres sacris tuendis Ritibus præpositi rescribendum censuerunt—*Placere seu, iuxta votum Magistri cæremoniarum*—ac proinde decreverunt a Sacerdote redeunte ad altare post Fidelium Communionem genuflectendum, antequam cooperiat sacram pyxidem et iterum genuflectendum, antequam pyxide in tabernaculo reposita, ipsius tabernaculi ostiolum claudat. Atque ita ubique servandum mandarunt. Die 23 Decembris, 1862. [This decree is decisive in favour of the view expressed n. 699. We did not see it till it appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, July 1866, when the sheet containing n. 699 had been printed; otherwise it would have saved us all reasoning on the question.]

The following decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences are taken from the *Decreta Authentica*, etc., by Prinzivalli.

CCCLVII. *Vindana in Britannia Minore*, 20 Sept., 1775. *Dub.* 6^m^ Benedictio in articulo mortis potestne bis aut amplius in eodem morbo qui insperate protrahitur, impertiri, etiamsi non convaluerit segrotus? Si possit iterari hæc benedictio, quodnam requiritur intervallum inter ejus largitiones? *Dub.* 7^m^ Invocatio saltem mentalis, de qua fit mentio in Brevibus ad Episcopos de hac benedictione missis præscribiturne, quamdiu segrotus suæ mentis est compos, ut conditio sine qua non, ad Indulgentiam vi istius benedictionis lucrandam? *Dub.* 8^m^ Episcopus ad supradictam benedictionem impertiendam delegatus cum facultate subdelegandi: *primo* debetne per paucos subdelegare Sacerdotes, ut majus sit benedictionis istius et Indulgentiæ huic adnexæ desiderium, simul et major utrique concilietur reverentia? *secundo:* potestne omnes suæ Diœcesis subdelegare Confessarios, ne etiam una si fieri possit ex

suis ovibus tanta privetur gratia? *tertio:* postestne subdelegare omnes directe et speciatim Parochos sive plurimos Sacerdotes in dignitate constitutos, et indirecte et confuse omnes Confessarios hisce verbis. "*Dilecto nobis in Christo, etc., te delegamus, eligimus et deputamus quatenus valeas, etc., insuper quemcumque Confessarium a te ad tui libitum semel vel pluries, et quandocumque opus fuerit, eligendum pariter eligimus et deputamus ad eamdem gratiam conferendam*", hic subdelegandi modus estne validus? Resp. Ad 6^m—Semel in eodem statu morbi. Ad 7^m—Affirmative. Ad 8^m Affirmative ad primam partem. Negative, ad secundam. Affirmative ad tertiam partem quoad parochos speciatim Ruri degentes". **962, 966.**

DVI. *Valentinen.*, 5 Feb., 1841. "5° Utrum sufficiat recitatio Confessionis, idest *Confiteor*, etc., in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ habita, pro recitatione illius præscripta quando impertienda sit benedictio cum Indulgentia in Mortis Articulo? Respondetur—Negative, juxta praxim, et Rubricas, nisi necessitas urgeat. 6° Utrum necesse sit tribus vicibus recitare *Confiteor*, etc., quando administratur Sacram Viaticum, Extrema Unctio, ac Indulgentia in Mortis Articulo impertitur? Respondetur—Affirmative juxta Praxim, et Rubricas. 7° Utrum infirmus lucrari possit Indulgentiam Plenariam in Mortis Articulo a pluribus Sacerdotibus facultatem habentibus impertiendam? Respondetur—Negative in eodem Mortis Articulo. 8° Utrum Sacerdos valide conferat Indulgentiam Plenariam in Mortis Articulo, omissa formula a Summo Pontifice præscripta, ob libri defícientiam? Respondetur—Negative, qui formula non est tantum directiva, sed præceptiva". **923, 974.**

DXI. *Briocen.*, 29 Maii, 1841. "An eodem die lucrari possint plures indulgentiæ plenariæ, quando pro unaquaque præscripta est perceptio divinæ Eucharistiæ? Resp.—Affirmative, servatis tamen respective aliis appositis conditionibus". **978.**

DXXIX. *Gandaven.*, 12 Feb., 1842. "1° Utrum Benedictio in articulo mortis juxta formulam Benedicti XIV. in Constitutione, *Pia Mater*, reiterari possit in eodem morbi statu? 2° Quatenus affirmative, an ea toties iterari possit quoties ægrotus in peccata saltem venialia relapsus ab eis absolvetur? Sac. Congregatio in una *Veronen.*, die 24 Septembris, 1838, responsum dedit caidam Dubio illius Episcopi. "An scilicet Benedictio Apostolica pluries impertiri posset novo mortis periculo redeunte?" et responsum fuit. "Negative, permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna; Affirmative vero si infirmus convaluerit, ac deinde quacumque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat". Et ita Sac. Congr. respondit Episcopo Gandavensi'. **962.**

The following decrees of the Sacred Congregations of the Council, of the Inquisition, and of Bishops, regarding Baptism and the Eucharist, bear on several of the important questions which we have had occasion to treat, many of them being expressly referred to. They are collected by Falisc, and subjoined by him to the decrees of the S. C. R., under the heads "Baptisma" and "Eucharistia".

1. Infantes sive dumi sive ab hæreticis baptizati, non sunt iterum sub conditione baptizandi, si non adsit probabile dubium invaliditatis baptismi. S. C. Conc. 27 Mart. 1683 (ZAMB.) S. C. Inq. 17 Nov. 1830, et 20 Julii 1840 (MISC. THEOL.) v. n, 7 et 8.

2. Pueri expositi etiamsi habeant schedulam de baptismo testantem, baptizentur sub conditione, nisi schedula habeat certitudinem. S. C. C., 5 Jan., 1724. (ZAMB.).

3. Baptismus non est sub conditione conferendus puellæ quæ christiane vixit et ad confirmationem admissa, licet parentes sint incerti. 2 Martii, 1765 (ZAMB.).

4. Fœtus in utero supra verticem baptizatus, post ortum denuo sub conditione baptizetur. S. C. C. 12 Julii, 1794 (ZAMB.).

5. Ad probandum validum baptisma sufficit unus fide dignus. S. C. C. 1769 (THES. tom. 30) et Bened. XIV. Bull. 1747.

6. Anno 1781 in Firmana, eadem dispensavit in irregularitate contracta ob reiteratum sub conditione baptismum (THES. tom. 50).

7. An Calvinistæ et Lutherani in illis partibus degentes, quorum baptisma dubium et suspectum est infidelcs habendi sint, ita ut inter eos et Catholicos disparitatis cultus impedimentum dirimens adesse censeatur?

Feria IV. die 17 Novembris, 1830.

In Congregatione generali S. Romanæ et Universalis Inquisitionis in conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam, coram Emin. et Rever. DD. S. Rom. Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus Inquisitoribus generalibus, proposito suprascripto dubio, iidem Emin. et Rever. DD., auditis DD. consultorum suffragiis decreverunt respondendum:

I. Quad hæreticos quorum sectæ Ritualia præscribunt collationem baptismi absque necessario usu materiæ et formæ essentialis, debet examinari casus particularis.

II. Quoad alios, qui juxta eorum Ritualia, baptizant valide, validum censendum est baptisma. Quod si dubium persistat etiam in primo casu, censendum est validum baptismum in ordine ad validitatem matrimonii.

III. Si autem certe cognoscatur nullum baptisma ex consuetudine actuali illius sectæ, nullum est matrimonium.

Eadem die et feria, Sanctissimus D. N. Gregorius divina providentia PP. XVI. in solita audientia R. P. Assessori S. Officii impertita, resolutionem prædictam ab Eminentissimis datam approbavit.

ANGELUS ARGENTI,
S. Rom. et Univ. Inquis. Notarius.

8. Vir quidam Protestans Anglicanæ ecclesiæ vult amplecti Catholicam religionem. In Anglia matrimonium fecit cum muliere, quæ ad sectam Anabaptistarum pertinebat, et quæ, prout ipse affirmat, nunquam baptizata fuit. Quum vir ipse baptismum a ministro Protestante Anglicano receperit, de validitate ejus proprii baptismatis ratio quoque gravis dubitandi existit. Propter jurgia continua mulierem Anabaptistam vir præfatus deseruit, venitque N. ubi matrimonium iterum fecit, sed cum muliere Lutherana. Quænam ex istis mulieribus tanquam ejus uxor vera haberi debet?

Feria IV., die 20 Julii, 1840.

Sanctissimus D. N. Gregorius divina providentia PP. XVI. in solita audientia R. P. Assessori S.

Officii impertita, audita relatione suprascripti dubii una cum Emin. et Rever. DD. Cardinalium Generalium Inquisitorum suffragiis, rescribi mandavit, quod dummodo constet de non collatione baptismi mulieris Anabaptistæ, primum matrimonium fuisse nullum; secundum vero, dummodo nullum aliud obstet impedimentum, fuisse validum. Ad dubium autem validitatis baptismi viri, standum esse decreto feriæ IV. Novembris, 1830, nempe, etc., ut supra.

ANGELUS ARGENTI,
S. Rom. et Univ. Inquis. Notarius.

1. Sanctissimum Sacramentum conservandum est in qualibet parochiali. Congr. Episc. 28 Jan., 1603, quantumvis paupere; quod si redditus et societas non sufficiant, instituatur quæstor vel eleemosynarum collector. Eadem, 14 Martii, 1614, et Congr. Conc. 22 Martii, 1594.

2. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum quando in omnibus parochialibus Montanæ regionis asservari pro tenuitate reddituum nequit, Episcopus decernere debet ut in singulas, ternas, quaternasque vicinas parochiales id onus distribuatur, ut in una ex eis habeatur Augustissimum Sacramentum, et ad impensum lampadis et hujusmodi, cæteræ vicinæ contribuant, et ubi se casus obtulerit, perinde uti rectores possint, ac si in propria parochiali illud asservaretur. 17 Aug., 1697, S. C. C. ap Petra, tom. 3, p. 166.

3. Debet quoque asservari in Regularium Ecclesiis quæ de hoc habent privilegium. Congr. Episc. 25 Maii, 1635.

4. Extra parochiales Ecclesias non conceditur retineri assidue Eucharistia. Eadem, 15 Jan., 1610.

5. Episcopus concedere non potest Ecclesiæ non parochiali, ut in ea retineatur SS. Sacramentum Eucharistiæ, sed requiritur licentia Sedis Apostolicæ. Cong. Conc. 3 Martii, 1668, et 3 Jan., 1683.

6. In Ecclesiis confraternitatum neque parochialibus neque regularibus, retineri non potest SS. Eucharistia sine speciali indulto Sedis Apostolicæ. 10 Dec., 1703, et 12 Jan., 1704, S. R. C.

7. SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum conservari potest in Ecclesiis etiam non parochialibus, si ab immemorabili fuerit in iisdem asservatum. Congr. Conc., 27 April, 1909.

8. SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum asservandum est uno tantum in loco cujuscumque Ecclesiæ, in qua custodiri debet, potest, aut solet. Congr. Episc. 13 Oct., 1620.

9. Tabernaculum regulariter debet esse ligneum, extra deauratum, intus vero aliquo panno serico decenter contectum. Ead. 26 Oct., 1575.

10. SS. Sacramentum teneri non debet in vasculis eburneis, sed in pyxide argentea intus deaurata. Ead. 26 Jul., 1588.

11. Tabernaculum SS. Sacramenti in cathedralibus non debet esse in altari majori, propter functiones pontificales, quæ fiunt versis renibus ad altare; in parochialibus et regularibus debet esse regulariter in altari majori tamquam digniori. Eadem, 10 Febr., 1579, et 20 Nov., 1594.

12. In tabernaculo SS. Sacramenti esse non debent vasa sacrorum oleorum, vel reliquiæ, vel aliud. Eadem, 3 Maii, 1693.

13. Legato de lampade ardente ante SS. Sacramentum satisfaciunt hæredes, per subministra-

tionem alii: apud ecclesiæ rectorem remanence cura ut continua ardeat. Eadem, 25 April, 1599.

14. Ad parochum privative competit jus retinendi clavem tabernaculi in quo reconditur SS. Sacramentum. S. C. C. 14 Nov., 1693. Petra. tom. 3, p. 163.

15. Renovatio SS. Sacramenti debet fieri qualibet Dominica non autem differri ad quindecim dies. Eadem, 5 April, 1573.

As the decrees of the Synod of Thurles are in the hands of nearly every priest on the Irish mission, we think it useless to give here those that are referred to in the volume. The following are the decrees of the Synods of Westminister and of Baltimore to which reference is made, besides those of which the words are cited.

EX DECRETIS CONCIL. WESTMON. PROV. I^mi.

XVI. *De Baptismo.*

1° In unaquaque ecclesiæ, cui annexa est cura animarum, sit fons baptismalis nisi ad tempus dispensaverit episcopus, in loco conspicuo et conveniente positus; in quo aqua baptismalis jugiter servetur.

2° Oleum catechumenorum et sanctum chrisma, necnon, si placet, sal, et alia ad baptismi administrationem requisita, in baptisterio, vel saltem in sacrario, seorsim, et cum omni reverentia, et summa cum munditie, asserventur. In novis ecclesiis ædificandis, præparetur locus in quo recondantur, in ipso baptisterio.

4° Baptismus in sola ecclesia debet administrari, nisi in casibus in Rituali exceptis; et quidem, seclusa casu periculi, vel gravis incommodi, non sine episcopi permissu. Excipiuntur baptismata quæ in stationibus a principali ecclesia seu sacello remotis administrantur, quando eas sacerdos, statutis quibusdam temporibus, vel vocatus, invisit.

XVIII. *De SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento.*

5° Ante S. Eucharistiam in tabernaculo repositam lampas die noctuque luceat. Pyxis velo serico albo, vel aureo cooperiatur.

6° Si vero ob periculum sacrilegii S. Sacramentum in altari vel etiam in ecclesia tuto servari non possit, præparandus est locus decens et semotus, ab episcopo approbandus; in quo conservetur, cum lampade semper accensa, ut in Decreto 5°.

12° Quamvis, ob locorum circumstantias, non liceat, absque sacrilegii et scandali periculo, Sanctissimum Viaticum ægrotis publice et solemniter deferre, et ideo a S. Sede nobis permissum jam sit sine lumine ac occulte illud portare. nunquam tamen non advertere sacerdos debet, se Deum absconditum sibi adhærentem habere, et secum ad suorum solatium ferre. Reverenter igitur, imo devote, et veluti in contemplatione defixus, Sanctissimum Sacramentum in sacculo decenter vel pretiose ornato, ad collum appenso, ad ægroti domum deferat. Et cum sæpe miserrimæ sint pauperum nostrorum habitationes, ita ut vix decore administrari in iis possit S. Viaticum, magnopere laudandum usum declaramus, et omnibus commenda-

tum volumus, deferendi secum, vel præmittendi, capsulam omnibus requisitis instructam, ad decentem sancti sacramenti administrationem. Quamprimum fieri possit, pyxis post communionem infirmorum ad ecclesiam deferatur, et usque ad purificationem in Tabernaculo reponatur.

XX. *De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis.*

4° Ad custodiam olei infirmorum habeat locum decentem, clave obseratum, si fieri potest in ecclesia, vel in sacrario: aut etiam, juxta præscriptum in Concilio prov. Mediolanensi IV., "in ipsa domo, loco decenti ac tuto". In novis ecclesiis ædificandis, paretur fenestella prope altare majus, cui inscribatur *Oleum infirmorum*, cum suo ostiolo clave munito.

EX DECRETIS CONCIL. BALTIMOREN. PROV. I^mi.

XIII. Quando diversa tum Sanctorum, tum familiæ nomina in baptismo infantibus tribuuntur si Sacerdos censuerit expedire, in prima interrogatione omnia nomina exprimat; in sequentibus tamen formis et precibus, nomina vulgò dicta Christiana tantum repetat. In libro autem baptismatum, omnia nomina recenseantur.

XV. Meminerint etiam Missionarii Rituale Romanum, et universalem Ecclesiæ consuetudinem exigere ut aqua, in baptismo adhibita, fuerit benedicta in eum finem, vel Sabbato sancto Paschæ, vel Sabbato Pentecostes, vel alio saltem tempore ante baptismi administrationem, forma in ipso Rituali præscripta. Curandum iis idcirco, ut Fontes baptismales, *sub clavi*, in unaquaque Ecclesia, ubi baptismi sacramentum ordinarie ministratur, quamprimum erigantur; prope quos, omnia quæ ad administrationem hujus Sacramenti pertinent, nitide serventur.

XVI. Ex præteritorum temporum difficultate, invaluit in his regionibus consuetudo baptismum privatis in domibus administrandi. Cum igitur magnæ gravitatis sit generalem legem in illis regionibus servandam statim ferre, cui contraria est consuetudo; etsi censemus curandum esse, quoad fieri potest, ut hoc Sacramentum in Ecclesia conferatur, tamen Episcoporum et Missionarium judicio relinquimus, ut statuant quando sint urgendi Fideles ut infantes ad Ecclesiam deferant, ut baptismus iis conferatur.

XIX. Optant Præsules hujus Provinciæ ut benedictio mulieris post partum, non promiscue, atque nulla ratione habita puerperæ dispositionis, neque extra Ecclesiam, vel locum ubi Sacrum fit, in posterum conferatur.

XXII. Quoniam uniformitas etiam in rebus minimis maxime optanda Ecclesiæ semper visa est, statuimus Superpelliceum esse debere modestum, decorum, et sacris functionibus conveniens. Statuimus etiam ut Biretum, cùm Episcopis singulis visum fuerit morem illud gestandi in suas Diœceses inducere, Romano Bireto sit conforme.

[The decrees XVI., XIX., and XXXII., had been framed somewhat differently, but were altered in accordance with the *Instructio circa decreta a Synodo Provinciali Baltimorensi edita*, by the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda,

which in reference to those decrees in their first form has the following:

In Decreto decimo sexto statuitur *In locis ubi Ecclesia est, aqua non Baptismalis non conferatur.* S. Congregatio intelligens cujus gravitatis sit generalem legem in regionibus illis servandam statim ferre, cui contraria est consuetudo: prae oculis habens damnationum magnam distantiam ab Ecclesia, etiam in oppidis ubi Ecclesia est, Episcopis commendat Decretum, de quo sermo est, in hunc modum immutare, ut appareat, habita ratione magni spatii quae saepe Ecclesia distare solet a locis ubi incolarum domicilia sunt fieri posse Baptismum extra Ecclesiam conferre: curandum tamen esse, quoad fieri potest, ut hoc Sacramentum in Ecclesia conferatur: Episcoporum denique et Missionariorum prudentiae relinquendum esse ut statuant quando sint urgendi fideles, ut infantes ad Ecclesiam deferant, ut baptismus eis conferatur.

In decimo nono Synodi Decreto, in quo statuitur puerperam in Ecclesia benedicendam esse, vel in locis ubi Sacrum fit, adhiberi tantum debere verba ejusmodi, quae intimationem continent, et Episcopos ita agere ostendant: nam valde periculosum est contrarium morem generali lege repente mutare. Praeterea, rituale Romanum non praescribit ejusmodi benedictionem in Ecclesia fieri; multoque minus vetat benedictionem hanc iis puerperis conferri, quae Paschale praeceptum non impleverint, vel Sacramentalem confessionem paulo ante non fecerint, prout in memorato decimo nono Baltimorensi Decreto continetur.

In Decreto trigesimo secundo, in quo agitur de forma Superpellicei adhibendi a Clericis, videtur satis esse affirmare *Superpelliceum esse debere modestum, decorum, et sacris functionibus conveniens.* In eo Decreto describitur quaedam superpellicei forma, et dicitur eam esse in S. Romana Ecclesia usitatam: affirmari tamen non potest eam solam superpellicei formam in Urbe Roma usitatam esse.]

Concil. Baltimoren., Prov. II[di] Decr. VII. Revmis. Episcopis S. Ludovici et Bostoniensi munus a Patribus demandatum est concinnandi, et hujus Concilii nomine et auctoritate, in lucem edendi Ritualis Romani accuratam editionem, necnon ejusdem breve exemplar in usum Missionariorum; atque utrisque editionibus, in modum appendicis, adjungendi modificationes hucusque a S. Sede concessas, una cum versione, vernacula lingua, eorum quae praedictis Praesulibus vertentenda esse visa fuerint.

Concil Baltimoren., Prov. III[ii] Decr. V. Placuit ut Rituale edatur Romano conforme, adjectis in appendice quae ad aedificationem Fidelium conducere visa fuerint, quod Baltimori edatur, auctoritate Illmi. et Revmi Archiepiscopi, et ubique per Foederatas Provincias servetur. Ne autem peculiares ritus cujusque arbitrio inducantur, districte vetamus ne Sacerdotes a forma sibi in Rituali praescripta, consuetudinis obtentu vel alio quocumque praetextu, discedant.

Concil. Baltimoren., Prov. IV. In quinta Congregatione privata. Primo Concilio Baltimorensi inhaerentes censuerunt Patres, in

Ritualis editione, interrogationum et precum quarumdam, Archiepiscopi judicio, versionem lingua vernacula, ad paginæ calcem inserendam, ut adhiberi possit quandocumque videatur expedire in Fidelium ædificationem, latina formula precum nunquam omissa.

Concil. Baltimoren., Prov. V^ti^ Decr. VIII. Patres unanimi voce probarunt Rituale Romanum editum auctoritate Conciliorum Provincialium secundi et quarti, curante Episcopo S. Ludovici, sed permiserunt ut Appendix fieret amplior, precibus quibusdam vernacula lingua redditis, judicio Archiepiscopi, prout in Concilio quarto decretum est. Districte tamen præceperunt Sacerdotibus omnibus latinam formam precum nunquam omittere.

Concil. Baltimoren., Plenarii Decreta.

II. Quæ in Septem Conciliis Baltimorensibus decreta sunt, ad omnes diœceses Fœderatorum Statuum, et regionum omnium generali Gubernio subditarum, extendi statuimus, eaque ubique vim obtinere.

III. Rituale Romanum, jam adoptatum a Concilio primo Baltimorensi, accurate servandum in sacris muneribus peragendis ubique in diœcesibus Statuum Fœderatorum decernimus, vetantes districte ne consuetudines ritusve a Romanis alieni introducantur. Ritus Ecclesiasticos nolumus adhiberi in sepultura fidelium, quandocumque eorum corpora sepeliuntur in cœmeteriis sectarum; vel etiam in cœmeteriis profanis, quando adsunt cœmeteria catholica.

XXIII. Quoniam gravissimæ Rationes a Patribus Concilii primi Baltimorensis Provincialis, A. S. 1829, allatæ, dum a SSmo. Patre peterent ut pro baptizandis adultis ea in hisce Provinciis uti liceret forma quæ in Rituali Romano pro baptismate parvulorum invenitur, adhuc vigent, immo in dies graviores evasuræ videntur; statuunt Patres S. Sedi supplicandum esse, ut privilegium tunc ad viginti annos juxta Patrum preces concessum, nunc perpetuum fiat, vel saltem ad viginti annos iterum concedatur.

Decretum quo prorogatur facultas adultos eadem ac parvulos forma baptizandi.

ARCHIEPISCOPI et Episcopi Plenarii Concilii Baltimorensis SSmum. Dnum. Nostrum PIUM PP. IX. obsecrandum censuerunt ut, permanentibus adhuc causis ob quas sa. me. decessor ejus PIUS PP. VIII., decretum S. Congregationis de Propag. Fide approbans die 26 Septembris anni 1830, annuit ut in baptismate adultorum is brevior cæremoniarum ordo adhiberi ad viginti annos posset, qui in Rituali Romano ad baptizandos pueros præscribitur, indultum hujusmodi rursus prorogare dignaretur. Precibus istis relatis ab Emo. ac Revmo. D. RAPHAELE Cardinali FORNARI in generali S. Congregationis conventu habito die 30 Augusti, 1852, Emi. Patres censuerunt supplicandum SSmo. pro indulti prorogatione ad quinquennium, atque ita ut interim Episcopi paulatim ad observantiam ritus descripti pro adultorum baptismate in Rituali Romano accedere satagant.

Hanc vero S. Congregationis sententiam SSmo. Dno. Nostro PIO PP. IX. ab infrascripto Secretario relatam in Audientia diei

5 Septembris. Sanctitas Sua benigne in omnibus probavit, ratumque habuit, contrariis quibuscumque haud obstantibus.

Datum Romæ, ex Ædibus dictæ S. C. de Propag. Fide, die 26 Septembris, 1852.

J. PH. CARD. FRANSONI, *Præf.*
AL. BARNABO, *a Secretis.*

Formula brevis conficiendæ aquæ Baptismalis, prascripta a Concilio Baltimorensi Provinciali primo, et a Pio Papa VIII. approbata, ad usum Missionariorum Americæ Septentrionalis.

BENEDICTIO FONTIS,
SEU AQUÆ BAPTISMALIS.

EXORCISO te, creatura aquæ, in nomine Dei Patris omnipotentis ✠, et in nomine Jesu Christi ✠ Filii ejus Domini nostri, et in virtute Spiritus ✠ Sancti. EXORCISO te, omnis virtus adversarii diaboli; ut omnis phantasia eradicetur, ac effugetur ab hac creatura aquæ et fiat fons aquæ salientis in vitam æternam, ut qui ex ea baptizati fuerint, fiant templum Dei vivi, et Spiritus sanctus habitet in eis in remissionem peccatorum: in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, et sæculum per ignem. R. Amen.

OREMUS.

Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, aquarum spiritualium sanctificator te supplices deprecamur ut hoc ministerium humilitatis nostræ respicere digneris, et super has aquas, abluendis et vivificandis hominibus præparatas, Angelum sanctitatis emittas, ut peccatis prioris vitæ ablutis, renatique detersa, purum sacrato Spiritui habitaculum regenerationibus procuret. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. R. Amen.

Infundat deinceps Sanctum Oleum in aquam, in modum crucis, dicens:

Conjunctio olei unctionis, et aquæ baptismatis, sanctificetur et fœcundetur. In nomine Patris ✠, et Filii ✠, et Spiritus ✠ sancti. R. Amen.

Deinde Chrisma aquæ infundat, in modum crucis, et dicat:

Conjunctio Chrismatis sanctificationis, et Olei unctionis, et aquæ baptismatis, sanctificetur et fœcundetur. In nomine Patris, ✠, et Filii ✠, et Spiritus ✠ sancti R. Amen.

Denique dicat benedicens ipsam aquam:

Sanctificetur et fœcundetur, Fons iste, et ex eo renascentes. In nomine Patris ✠, et Filii ✠, et Spiritus ✠, sancti. R. Amen.

Modus excipiendi professionem fidei Catholicæ a neo-conversis, juxta formam a S. Congregatione S. Officii, die 20 Julii, 1859, prescriptum.

In conversione hæreticorum inquirendum est primo de validitate baptismi in hæresi suscepti. Instituto igitur diligenti examine, si compertum fuerit, aut nullum, aut nulliter collatum fuisse, baptizandi erunt absolute. Si autem, investigatione peracta, adhuc probabile dubium de baptismi validitate supersit, tunc sub conditione iteratur, juxta ordinem baptismi Adultorum. Demum, si constiterit validum fuisse, recipiendi erunt tantummodo ad abjurationem, seu professionem fidei. Triplex igitur in conciliandis hæreticis distinguitur procedendi methodus:

I. Si baptismus absolute conferatur nulla sequitur abjuratio, nec

absolutio, eo quod omnia abluit sacramentum regenerationis.

II. Si baptismus sit sub conditione iterandus, hoc ordine procedendum erit: 1° Abjuratio, seu fidei professio; 2° Baptismus conditionalis; 3° Confessio sacramentalis cum absolutione conditionata.

III. Quando denique validum judicatum fuerit baptisma, sola recipitur abjuratio, seu fidei professio, quam absolutio a censuris sequitur. Si tamen nonnunquam ejusmodi Neo-conversus valde desideret ut ritus in ejus baptismo olim omissi, hac occasione suppleantur, Sacerdos huic pio ejus voto morem gerere utique liberum habet. Debebit tamen in tali casu adhibere ordinem baptismi Adultorum, et mutare mutanda ob baptismum jam valide susceptum.

The authors who have written *ex professo* on the rubrics of the Ritual are few in number, compared with those who have written on the rubrics of the Missal and Breviary. But the rubrics of the Ritual and those of the Missal sometimes regard the same matter, *e.g.*, the administration of the Eucharist, and then the same commentary to a great extent serves for both. Besides, many of the important questions involved are treated by the theologians generally (*Vid. introduction*, n. 9–10, 93).

The first complete commentary on the rubrics of the Ritual, and still one of the best, is that of Baruffaldi, "*Ad Rituale Romanum Commentaria*, Auctore HIERONYMO BARUFFALDO, Ferrariensi, Sacræ Inquisitionis Consultore, et insignis Collegiatæ Centensis Archipresbytero". 1 vol. 4to. Venetiis, 1792.

Baruffaldi has done for the Ritual what Gavantus had previously done for the Missal. He gives the entire text of the rubric divided into "Titles", and subdivided into sections, under which he gives his commentary. This is undoubtedly the most satisfactory plan for a work of the kind. The advantage to the reader of having under his eye the words of the rubric more than compensates for the increased size of the book. On questions connected with the rubrics of the Ritual, even to the present day, no author is referred to more frequently, or with greater respect by the consultors of the Sacred Congregation, than Baruffaldi.

Catalani also wrote a complete commentary on the Ritual. He follows the general plan of Baruffaldi, but attends less to the manner of performing the ceremonies, than to their symbolical meaning, origin, and history. The title of his work explains the object the author proposed to himself. "*Rituale Romanum, Benedicti Papæ XIV. jussu editum et auctum, perpetuis Commentariis exornatum ac in duos Tomos divisum, quibus vetus ac nova Sacrorum Rituum Disciplina Sanctorum Patrum ac insignium Ritualium Testimoniis, Romanorum Pontificum et Conciliorum Decretis, Sacrarum S. R. E. Cardinalium Congregationum Responsis, ac variarum Ecclesiarum Praxi recensetur atque explicatur. Eidem SSmo. Patri dicatum.* Auctore JOSEPHO CATALANO, presbytero Oratorii S. Hieronymi Charitatis". 2 vols. folio, Patavii, 1770. He wrote also a commentary on the

Roman Pontifical, to which we refer in one or two places.

"R. P. Joannis Michelis Cavalieri, Bergomatis, Ord. Eremit. Sti. Augustini Cong. Observ. Lomb. S. Theologiæ lectoris emeriti *Opera omnia liturgica seu Commentaria in authentica Sac. Rit. Cong. Decreta, ad Romanum præsertim Breviarium, Missale et Rituale quomodolibet attinentia Quinque Tomis comprehensa*". 5 vols. folio—Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1764.

The liturgical works of Cavalieri, though professedly only commentaries on the decrees of the S. C. R., contain a commentary on a good part of the rubrics of the Ritual, which are cited and explained under the decrees that regard the same matter. He not only explains the ceremonies, but enters, sometimes at considerable length, into the questions of theology and canon law that arise out of the rubrics. He is highly esteemed for his learning and accuracy, and is cited as a standard authority by subsequent writers, especially by Gardellini.

"*Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis* a Sancto Carolo, Cardinali S. Praxedis Archiep. Mediolanen. *condita*" (2 vols., folio, Lugduni, 1683). This great work by St. Charles Borromeo, called by Baruffaldi "vere aureum opus" (Tit. x. n. 45), has been always regarded as of the highest authority on the ceremonies of the Ritual. In fact most of the rubrics of the present Roman Ritual are taken from it.

"*De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, Libri Tres, ex variis insigniorum Ecclesiarum Pontificalibus, Sacramentariis, Missalibus, Breviariis, Ritualibus sive Manualibus, Ordinariis seu Consuetudinariis, cum manuscriptis tum editis; ex diversis Conciliorum Decretis, Episcoporum Statutis, aliisque probatis Auctoribus permultis, collecti atque exornati* a R. P. Edmundo Martene, presbytero et monacho Benedictino e Congreg. S. Mauri" (4 vol. in folio, Venetiis, 1783). This work is looked on by all as the great authority on the history and antiquity of ecclesiastical ceremonies, and their variety in different parts of the Church. Nearly all that Catalani has on these subjects in his commentary, is taken from Martene.

"Catechismus *ex decreto* SS. Concilii Tridentini, *ad Parochos Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editus. Translated into English and published with the original Latin text by J. Donovan, D.D.*" (2 vols. 8vo, Rome, 1839). The Catechism of the Council of Trent supplies, in many instances, the best explanation of the text of the rubric, while its authority is not much less than that of the rubric itself (vid. n. 132).

Many important questions regarding the administration of the sacraments are treated by Benedict XIV., "*De Synodo Diœcesana Libri Tredecim*" (given *in extenso* in vol. 25th of the "*Theologiæ Cursus Completus*", Parisiis, 1840). References are made also to his "*De SS. Missæ Sacrificio*" and "*De Festis*" (the former in vol. 23d; the latter in vol. 26th of the "*Cursus*): his "*Institutiones*" (being vol. 10th. "*Lambertini Opera*". Typographia Bassanensi, 1767) and his "*Bullarium*" (Venetiis, 1778).

The Ritual of Toulon may be looked on as a kind of commentary on the Roman Ritual.

The parts of it that regard Baptism and Extreme Unction, are given in the "*Dictionnaire Des Cérémonies et Des Rites Sacrés*" (3 vols. imp. 8vo. Migne, Paris, 1846). It is often found to touch on minute details that others do not notice.

Amongst modern works the "*Sacræ Liturgiæ Praxis juxta Ritum Romanum, in Missæ celebratione, Officii recitatione et Sacramentorum administratione servanda*, cura P. J. B. De Herdt, Archidiœcesis Mechlinensis presbyteri" (Editio tertia, 3 vols. 8vo. Lovanii, 1855), contains a pretty full explanation of the rubrics of the Ritual. It embodies nearly all the text, and gives minute instructions on the manner of performing the ceremonies. The work is in high repute for its clearness and general accuracy.

The "*Cours Abrégé De Liturgie Pratique, comprenant l' explication du Missel, du Breviaire, et du Rituel, a l' usage des Eglises qui suivent le Rit Romain, par* M. L' Abbe Falise" (seconde édition, 1 vol. 8vo. Paris, 1855), has a brief, but clear and comprehensive commentary on the rubrics of the Ritual. It often gives, in a single sentence, the various opinions that are held, as well as the practical decision, on a disputed question.

The "*Modo Pratico di assistere a' Moribondi, di dirigerli nel fare il testamento, di amministrare loro i Sacramenti, e di aiutare a ben morire i giustiziati, diretto a' Rev. Parrochi ed a' Sacerdoti*, dal P. M. Antonio Brandimarte, Min. Conv. e Parroco Romano" (1 vol. 12mo. Roma, 1818), contains important instructions on the administration of the Viaticum and Extreme Unction, and is of great value as an evidence of the actual practice in the city of Rome.

The "Melanges Theologiques par une Société d' Ecclésiastiques" (Nouvelle Edition revue et corrigée, 6 vols. 8vo. Paris, Tournai, 1859); the "Revue Theologique *faisant suite aux Mélanges Théologiques*', par une société de Prêtres Belges et Français" (Paris, 1856 et seq.), and the "Analecta Juris Pontificii" (Rome, 1855 et seq.), contain a great many important decisions and valuable dissertations on matters pertaining to the Ritual.

On questions of moral theology, St. Liguori is by common consent the great authority (the references are to the edition in 10 vols., small 8vo, Mechliniæ, 1845). Where he speaks clearly, we seldom refer to any other. But on many points involved in the rubric, he is either silent, or touches but slightly and without giving any decided opinion. On these we refer to other authors well known to students of theology.

On many of the rubrics that regard the Eucharist, the principal authority is the "*Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum*, Auctore Rev. Patre D. Bartholomæo Gavanto, Cong. Cler. Reg. S. Pauli, S. R. C. Consultore, etc., *Cum novis Observationibus et Additionibus*, R. P. D. Cajetani-Mariæ Merati, Cler. Reg. ejusdem S. R. C. Consultoris" (4 vols, 4to. Venetiis, 1823); but recent writers on the ceremonies of the Missal are also cited.

For the fuller and more satisfactory explanation of a few points, we have had occasion to refer to the works of some of the great Scholastics, and on various

incidental questions we have made use of any works within our reach, that seemed to us to throw light on the particular question treated. For the satisfaction of the reader, we subjoin the titles and editions of these, which (besides the works already noticed) have been used in compiling the volume.

A LAPIDE. *Comment. in Sac. Script.* Folio, Lugduni, 1690.

Annals of the Propagation of the Faith. 8vo, Dublin.

BALDESCHI. *Esposizione delle Sacre Ceremonie, etc.* 3 vols., 12mo, Roma, 1857.

BAULDRY. *Manuale Sacrarum Cæremoniarum, etc.* 1 vol. 4to, Venetiis, 1745.

BELLARMINE. *De Controversiis adversus Hæreticos.* 4 vols. folio, Mediolani, 1721.

BILLUART. *Cursus Theologiæ juxta mentem D. Thomæ.* 10 vols. 8vo, Parisiis, 1839.

BONA. *Rerum Liturgicarum, Libri Duo.* 1 vol. 4to, Romæ, 1671.

BOUIX. *De Jure Liturgico.* 1 vol. 8vo, Atrebati, 1860. *De Parocho.* 1 vol. 8vo, Parisiis, 1855.

BOUVIER. *Institutiones Theologicæ.* Editio nova, 6 vols. 12mo, Parisiis, 1856. *Abrégé D'Embryologie* in *Supplemento ad Tract. de Matrim.* 12mo, Parisiis, 1846. *Traité Des Indulgences.* 10me edit., 1 vol. 12mo, Paris, 1855.

Bullarium Romanum. Edit. Car. Coquelenes. Roma, 1739 et seq.

Cæremoniale Episcoporum. 1 vol. 8vo, Romæ, 1848.

CARDENAS. *Crisis Theologica.* Venetiis, 1694.

CARON. *Les Cérémonies de la Messe Basse, Appendice au Traité des SS. Mystères par Collet.* Paris, 1848.

CARRIERE. *De Matrimonio.* 2 vols. 8vo, Parisiis, 1837. *De Justitia et Jure,* 3 vols. 8vo, Lovanii, 1845.

Cérémonial des Evêques commenté et expliqué par un Evêque Suffragant de Quebec. 1 vol. 8vo, Paris, 1856.

CHARDON. *Histoire Des Sacrements,* in *Theologiæ Cursu Completo.* Vol. XXmo Parisiis, 1840.

CABRICATUS. *Decisiones Sacramentales.* 3 vols. folio, Anconæ, 1757.

Collections on Irish Church History, from the MSS. of the late V. Rev. LAURENCE F. RENEHAN, D.D., President of Maynooth College, edited by the Rev. DANIEL MCCARTHY. Vol. I. 8vo, Dublin, 1861.

COLLET. *Prælect. Theol. Honorati Tournely. Continuatio, sive Tractatus de universa Theologia Morali.* 8 vols. 4to, Venetiis, 1746–58. *Traité des Saints Mystères.* 12me edition, 1 vol. 8vo, Paris, 1848.

Concilii Tridentini, Canones et Decreta. 1 vol. 32mo, Parisiis, 1837.

Concilia Provincialia Baltimori habita ab anno 1829 *ad annum* 1849. 8vo, Baltimori, 1851.

Concilium Plenarium Totius Americæ Septentrionalis Foederatæ Baltimori habitum anno 1852. 8vo, Baltimori, 1853.

Concilii Primi Provincialis Westmonasteriensis habiti 1852, *apud Oscott.* 8vo. ex typis, J. P. Migne, 1853.

CONINCK. *De Sacramentis et Censuris.* Folio, Rhotomagi, 1630.

DALGAIRNS. *The Holy Communion, its Philosophy, Theology, and Practice.* 1 vol. 8vo, Dublin, 1861.

DEBREYNE. *Traité Pratique*

D'Embryologie Sacrée ou Théologique. 12mo, Bruxelles, 1853.

Decreta Authentica, Cong. Sac. Rit. ex Actis ejusdem collecta, cura et studio Aloisii Gardellini. 4 vols. 4to, Romæ 1856 (vid. n. 37–8).

Decreta Authentica. Sac. Rit. Cong. alphabetico ordine disposita, cura M. Falise. Editio 4ta, 1 vol. 8vo, Parisiis, 1862 (vid. n. 39).

Decreta Authentica Sacræ Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis præpositæ accurate collecta ab Aloisio Prinzivalli, Suffecto ab Actis ejusdem Sac. Cong. 1 vol. 8vo, Bruxellis, 1862.

Delahogue. *Tractatus de Sacramentis in genere.* 1 vol. 12mo, Dublinii, 1828.

De Lugo. *Opera Omnia.* 7 vols. folio. Venetiis, 1718.

Dens. *Theologia ad usum Seminariorum.* 8 vols. 8vo, Mechliniæ, 1830.

Denzinger. *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum quæ de Rebus Fidei et Morum a Conciliis Œcumenicis et Summis Pontificibus emanarunt.* 1 vol. 12mo, Wirceburgi, 1865.

Devoti. *Institutionum Canonicarum Libri Quatuor.* 2 vols. 8vo, Gandæ, 1836.

Droun. *De Sacramentis in genere* in *Theologiæ Cursu Completo.* Vol. XXmo, Parisiis, 1840.

Du Cange. *Glossarium. med. et inf. Latinitatis.* 10 vols. folio, Parisiis, 1733–66.

ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ. 1 vol. royal 8vo, En Benetia, 1854.

Estius. *Comment. in Epistolas.* 8vo, Moguntiæ, 1841.

Ferraris. *Prompta Bibliotheca.* 8 vols. 4to, edit. Migne. Parisiis, 1860.

Fornici. *Institutiones Liturgicæ ad usum Seminarii Romani.* 1 vol. 8vo, Parisiis, 1859.

Goar. ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ *sive Rituale Græcorum Illustratum.* 1 vol. folio, Lutetiæ Parisiorum, 1647.

Gousset. *Théologie Morale.* 8me edition, 2 vols. 8vo, Bruxelles, 1846.

Gury. *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis.* 12ma editio, 2 vols. 12mo, Paris, 1861.

Hook. *A Church Dictionary.* 6th edition, 1 vol. 8vo, London, 1852.

Janssens. *Explanatio Rubricarum Missalis Romani.* 2 vols. 8vo, Antverpiæ, 1757.

Kenrick. *Theologia Dogmatica.* 3 vols. 8vo, Mechliniæ, 1858.

Labbe, curante Coleti. *Sacrosancta Concilia.* Venetiis, 1728–33.

Lacroix. *Theologia Moralis.* 3 vols. folio, Venetiis, 1753.

Lingard. *History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church.* 2 vols. 8vo, London, 1845.

Mabillon. *De Liturgia Gallicana Libri Tres.* 4to, 1685.

Macri. *Hierolexicon sive Sacrum Dictionarium.* Venetiis, 1735.

Maskell. *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.* 3 vols, 8vo. London, 1846.

Manuel des Cérémonies Romaines. Nouvelle edition, 3 vols. 12mo, Paris, 1858.

Memoriale Rituum jussu Benedicti XIII. edit. in *Manuali Sacrarum Cæremoniarum.* 1 vol. 4to, Dublini, 1856.

Melchior Canus. *De Locis Theologicis* edit. in *Theologiæ Cursu completo.* Vol. Imo Parisiis, 1839.

Monita ad Missionarios S. Cong. De Propaganda Fide. 1 vol. 12mo, Roma, 1853.

Murray. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi.* 8vo, Dublinii, 1860.

Paley. *Illustration of Baptis-*

...ani Fonts. 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1843.

...Origines Liturgicæ. 2 vols 8vo. London. 1845.

PALMER. *Thesaurus et Praxis in quæ Jure, Obiurgationes et Privilegia eorum qui in Parochiis aut Ecclesiis Matrix ministrantur, atque alia plura Data ad utrumque Forum pertinentia ex Theologiæ principiis atque sacris et canonicis Legibus breviter et distincte explicantur Jura pertractantur.* 1 vol. 4to. Romæ. 1656.

PERRONE. *Prælectiones Theologicæ.* 2 vols. imp. 8vo. Parisiis, 1842.

Pontificale Romanum. Mechliniæ. 1845.

Rituale, or Collection of Individual Prayers. Authorized Translation. 12mo. London. 1859.

RAFFENSPERGER. *Jus Canonicum Universum.* 6 vols. folio. Romæ. 1851.

RESTAURINE. *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.* 2 vols. 4to, Francofurti. 1847.

RITUAL.—*Ordo administrandi Sacramenta et alias quasdam Officia Ecclesiastica rite peragendi in Missione Anglicana: ex Rituali Romano jussu Pauli V. edito excerptus, nonnullis adjectis ex Anglicano Rituali Anglicano.* 16mo, Dublin. 1858.

Excerpta ex Rituali Romano, pro Administratione Sacramentorum ad commodiorem Usum Missionariorum in Septentrionalis America Fœderata Provincias 32mo, Baltimori, 1860. Vid. n. 297.

Epitome Ritualis Romani ad commodiorem Usum Clericorum Missionis Scotiæ. 32mo, Glasgow. 1859.

ROHRER. *Praxis Celebrandi Missam etc.* Edit. J. H. Hazé, 3 vols. 8vo. Mechliniæ, 1854.

SANCTI THOMÆ AQUINATIS. *Summa Theologica.* Edit. Migne, 4 vols. imp. 8vo, Parisiis, 1861.

SCAVINI. *Theologia Moralis Universa.* 3 vols. 8vo, Bruxellis, 1847.

SCARES. *Opera Omnia.* 26 vols. imp. 8vo, Parisiis, 1856-61.

SYLVESTER. *Compendium Theologiæ Classicum.* Petropoli, 1799.

TOURNELY. *De Baptismo* edit. in *Theologiæ Cursu Completo.* vol. XXI^mo^ Parisiis, 1840.

VAVASSEUR. *Cérémonial selon le Rit Romain.* 3^me^ edition, 2 vols. 12mo, Paris, 1865.

WATERWORTH. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, translated.* 1 vol. 8vo, London, 1848.

WHEATLY. *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer.* 1 vol. 8vo, London. 1842.

WILKINS. *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ.* 4 vols. folio. Londini, 1737.

ZACCARIA. *Bibliotheca Ritualis.* 2 vols. 4to, Romæ, 1776.

GENERAL INDEX.

The figures indicate the marginal numbers.

ABLUTION—in Baptism 160; of the fingers after communion, 694, 697-8; after the Viaticum, 825-6.

ABSOLUTION—of converts baptized conditionally, 466; from heresy, 467-8; always in practice given before Extreme Unction, 851; given repeatedly to the dying, 970-1.

ADULT—in baptism, who is to be regarded as, 424.

APOSTOLIC Benediction with plenary indulgence "in articulo mortis"—faculty of giving, greatly extended by Benedict XIV., 958-9; may be given to those who are judged fit for Extreme Unction—and probably also to one in danger of death from violence, etc., 960; to children though too young to receive the Viaticum, 961; can be given only once in the same danger, but may be repeated in case of relapse after partial recovery, 962; or if not yet received in the state of grace, 963; generally given immediately after the last sacraments, 964; bishops usually delegate the faculty to all confessors, 965-6; but the delegation should be distinctly expressed, 967; ceremonies to be observed, 968; vestments, 969; dispositions required, especially resignation to God's will, 970-2; form to be used, 974$_7$5; form in urgent necessity, 976-7; many other indulgences may be gained by the sick, 978-9; and should be suggested to them by the priest, 980.

ATTENTION—in the minister of a sacrament, 136; virtual, what is meant by, *ibid.*

BAPTISM—definition of, 148; necessary to salvation, 149-50; "necessitate medii", 151; want of, supplied only by perfect charity or martyrdom, 152; no other sacrament can be received before, 153; by effusion, immersion, aspersion, 175-8; of infants, 192-3; of fœtus in case of abortion, 211-3; of foundlings, 214; of children whose parents are not Catholics, 215; of monsters, 216-7; ancient discipline regarding time of, 235; gradually abolished, 236; though vestiges of it still remain in the ceremonies of Easter and Pentecost, 237; place of administering, 238-42; may be conferred on two or more infants together, 359-61; with many of the prayers and ceremonies applied to all in common, 362-78; how conferred in danger of death, 379-82; on a number in extreme necessity, 527.

—— matter of, water essential, 156-7; for solemn Baptism must be blessed, 158-9; common may be added but in less quantity, 160-1; what if frozen or too cold, 164-5; poured on the head should fall into the sacrarium or into a vessel for the purpose, 181-3; manner of pouring on, 344-5; of immersing in, 346, 522; water of the font, when it can be had, should be used in private baptism, otherwise common water

may be used, 283: can be blessed generally speaking, only in the church, 284: but may in some cases be blessed elsewhere, 291: short form of blessing used in some places, 287–8.

—— form of what words are essential, 317: form not part of, 318: form used by the Apostles, 318: in Greek Church, indicative not imperative, 323: combination when used, 323–4, 454: permanent while the matter is applied, 318.

—— ministration of solemn, performed only in the church, 134, 282: sometimes permitted in private houses, 146, 281: in use from the earliest times, 256: some peculiar to certain provinces, 321, 356: how far permitted in private houses in Ireland, England and America, 286–8, 294–7: all that follow Baptism may be performed anywhere, 296: if omitted, how and where supplied, 338–44.

—— mystic, in, should sometimes be inferred until the new rite are practised, 255–6: manner of applying, 333–4: antiquity of, 335: Greek usage, 336: mystic meaning of, 337: oil of how removed, 336.

—— minister of, the parish priest, or another priest with his leave, 144: in necessity any one who can apply the matter and form, but a certain order should be observed, 156: contracts a relationship even when he baptizes in necessity, 158: what if the parent, 189–91; can he act at the same time as sponsor? 233.

—— order of, vesting, 285–7; going to the door or porch, 288; preliminary questions, 290; how the infant is held, 294; interrogations, prayers, etc., for infants, 295—851: for adults, specially solemn, 425: priest should, if he can, wear a cope, 477: should pray for some time and recite certain psalms at the altar, 474–5: after which he goes to the porch, 477; and proceeds with the ceremony as directed, 478—527: vid *Ceremonies, Font, Sponsor*, etc.

Baptists—do not baptize infants: baptism of adults by, sufficiently doubtful to justify conditional baptism in case of conversion, 457.

Baptistery—at first a building apart from the church, but now usually a chapel within, 239; should be veiled off and suitably adorned, 243: font itself so called, ibid.

Berretta—or priest's cap in solemn baptism, 287.

Bishop—pastoral duties of, in the first three centuries, 100; ordinary pastor in every part of his diocese, 102: baptism of adults reserved to, 154, 435: how vested and attended when he baptizes 535–43: in giving Communion 664, 666.

Blessed Eucharist — dignity and excellence of, 574–5; how kept during the persecutions, 595–6; present discipline regarding place of keeping, 597–8; particles should be renewed every eight days, 618–9; renewal should not be deferred beyond fifteen, 620; particles to be consecrated should be recently made, 621; should be round and freed from loose fragments, 648; how administered in the first ages, 677–9; how at present in the churches of the East, 680–2; vid. *Communion, Viaticum*, etc.

Blessing of women after childbirth—origin and antiquity of, 557–8; not of obligation, 559;

to whom it may be refused, 560; should be given only in the church except in rare cases, 561–2; by whom given, 563; how long after the birth, 564; child need not be present, 565; ceremonies observed in, 566-73.

Blessing "in articulo mortis", vid *Apostolic Benediction.*

Books—liturgical, 3–4; necessary to the pastor, 146-7; for registry of names, 284, 761.

Burse—for corporal, how and by whom carried, 661-2: colour of, 664.

Cæsarean operation—obligation of performing, 200–1; precautions with regard to the infant, 202; should be performed by a surgeon, 203; is a priest bound if there be no one else? *ibid.*; instructions regarding, 204–5; often successful while the mother is living, 207; mother may be bound to submit to, 208; rare in these countries, 209; operations destructive of infant unlawful, 210.

Candles—in the ceremonies of baptism, 283, 354–5; blessing after childbirth, 572; Communion, 660; the Viaticum, 792; Extreme Unction, 904; how supplied in houses of the poor, 905.

Canopy—for procession of the Blessed Sacrament, 791.

Catechism of the Council of Trent—authority and usefulness of, 132; specially recommended for instructions on the sacraments, 145.

Catechumens—kept outside the church, 288; why so called, 421; grades or classes of, *ibid.*; probation and instruction of, 422–6; intention, 427; dispositions, 428; time for preparation, 429; mysteries necessary to be believed by, 430–4; time of baptizing, 436–7; must answer for themselves, 438-40; recommended but not required to be fasting, 441; must have sorrow for actual sin, 442–7; when called "Electi", 476; position of, at the door, 483, 502; position of, at the font, 512–4.

Chrism—vertical unction with, how introduced, 248; must be blessed by the bishop even in the Greek Church, 249; how applied in Baptism, 349; may be applied outside the church, 398.

Clerks—in the administration of the sacraments, 126; laics acting as, may wear soutane and surplice, *ibid.*; instruction of, 127; females cannot act as, 128; in baptism, 285; in baptism of adults, 473–4; in blessing the font, 546–7; in blessing after childbirth, 566; in giving communion, 659, 665; in Extreme Unction, 910, 926.

Communion—administered to infants in the early Church, and to the present day in the Greek and other Oriental Churches, 417–8; but not for many centuries in the Latin Church, 419; administered to adults immediately after Baptism, 526; practice of the Church regarding, described by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, 577; St. Liguori on frequent, 578; preparations for, 579; previous Confession, 580-1; what if a sin be forgotten, 582; what of those who communicate often, 583; exterior modesty, 584; fast required, 586–7; how violated, 588; exceptions, 589; posture of body, 590; of men and women separately, 591; to be observed in the act of receiving, and immediately after, 592-4; should be administered by the pastor when reasonably asked for, 625; but refused to public sinners, 626–7; until they have given proof of amendment, 628–9; oc-

cult sinners to be excluded in private, 630; if they be known as such independently of confession, 631; but admitted in public and why, 632; what if their crime be public elsewhere, 633; what if they can be passed over without scandal, 634; when administered to the insane, 635; when to those whose reason is weak, 636.

—— of children, 637; how we are to understand "*annos discretionis*", 638–9; to be administered to them in danger of death, if they can distinguish it from other food, 640; what is meant by this, 641; importance of first communion, 642; preparatory instructions, 643–4; ceremonies of, 645; usually fixed for Paschal time, 646.

—— order of, purification prescribed by the Rubric, 649; no longer in use, 650; communion cloth how held, 651–2; patena under the chin when permitted, *ibid.*; what if a particle should fall on the floor, or on the dress of a communicant, 653–4; what if a minute fragment observed only by the priest, 655; chalice veil or finger towel not to be used as a communion cloth, 656; preparation, vesting, going to the altar, 657–62; taking out the ciborium, 663; "*Misereatur*", "*Indulgentiam*" in the plural, 666–8; "*Ecce Agnus Dei*", etc., not to be repeated in the vernacular, 672; priest descends by front steps and commences at the epistle side, 673; to be observed in taking each particle out of the ciborium, 683; in saying "*Corpus Domini*", etc., 685; in placing the Host on the tongue, 687; purificator may be used to remove moisture from the fingers, 688–9; particles may be divided, 691; or part of a large Host given, 692; ceremonies and prayers on returning to the altar, 694–6; ablution of the fingers, 697–8; genuflections, 699; benediction of the communicants, 700; and return to the sacristy, 701.

—— ceremonies of, at Mass, 713–7, 724–5; immediately after, or before Mass, 726–8; what if the Blessed Sacrament be at a different altar, 729; communion in a private oratory, 732.

—— of the clergy, 674; a priest may sometimes receive from his own hand "extra missam," 675; should wear a stole, 676; order to be observed at solemn Mass, 718–20; at low Mass, 721; posture on returning to choir, 722; when the "Communio" is sung, 723.

—— time of, Mass proper time, 702; only from the aurora until mid-day unless by indult, 703; reasons for giving "extra Missam," 703–5: may be given at a requiem Mass with particles consecrated at the Mass, 706; or with pre-consecrated particles, 707; if violet vestments be used, 708; or even in black, where such is the custom, 709; prohibited at midnight Mass of Christmas, 710; and from the Mass of Holy Thursday till that of Holy Saturday, 711–2.

—— of the sick, vid. *Viaticum.*

CONFESSION—before administering a sacrament, 107–13; before receiving communion, *ibid;* may be heard without surplice or stole, 125; before Baptism, 445–6; of converts baptized conditionally, 463–6; seal of, 631; before the Viaticum, 812–3; before Extreme Unction, 850, 921.

CONFIRMATION—formerly administered to infants, 411–3; at present administered to them in the Western Church only in ex-

ceptional cases, 413–4; administered in the Greek Church by the priest immediately after Baptism, 415–6; administered to adults after Baptism, when there is a bishop to confer it, 526.

"Confiteor"—at Communion, 665; to be said (if necessary by the priest himself) before the Viaticum, 814–5; Extreme Unction, 923; and the Benediction "in articulo mortis", though the three should be given in immediate succession, 974.

Confraternity—of the Christian Doctrine, 644; of the Blessed Sacrament, 790, 795.

Converts—from heresy, baptism of, to be determined by inquiry into the ritual of the sect, and other circumstances in each case, 455–6; some are not to be baptized, others to be baptized absolutely, but most of them to be baptized conditionally, 457–8; ceremonies in baptizing, 459–61; profession of faith, and confession required from, 462–5; followed by conditional absolution, 466; many of them may be only material, not formal, heretics, 467; but in practice all are dealt with as having incurred the reserved censure, 468.

Cope—used in baptizing adults, 471–2.

Corporal—required in giving communion, 661–3; material of, 664; should be blessed, *ibid.*

Cotton—used in Baptism, where placed, 277; when used for wiping the fingers, 850; burned after use, 857; for Extreme Unction, divided into six or seven pellets, 904; to be afterwards burned, 930.

"Credo" and "Pater Noster"—in infant baptism, 323–6; in adult baptism, 504.

Criminals—about to suffer death should get the Viaticum, 780; but cannot be anointed, 868; may get the Benediction "in articulo mortis", 960.

Cross—sign of, 305; in Baptism, 306–8, 485, 491; in blessing any person or object, 312–3; in prayers, 317; in sprinkling holy water, 810, 920; at ℣ *Adjutorium nostrum*, etc., 811; processional, in carrying the holy oil to the sick, 910.

Crucifix—should be placed on the table prepared in sick chamber, 792, 904; otherwise the priest should have one with him, 911; to be kissed by the sick before he receives Extreme Unction, 920; and left with him, 944; thoughts suggested by, 945.

Crumbs of bread—for removing oil from the fingers, 280, 357, 904, 940; to be thrown into the fire, 942.

Custom—in rubrics, 42–4; of Rome, good interpreter of the rubric, 45; *præter legem*, may be binding, 46–8; *contra legem* may, when it has certain conditions, prevail against any human law, 50–1; consent of legislator, chief condition, 52; against the Roman Missal, 55–7; against the Roman Breviary, 58; against the Roman Pontifical, 59; against the Cæremoniale Episcoporum, 60–1; against the Roman Ritual, 62, 76–7; customs in Ireland against the rubrics, mostly the result of penal laws, 80–2; gradually disappearing, but cannot be suddenly abolished, 83–4; bishop to judge of, 85–6; Synod of Thurles on, 87; Sacred Congregation on similar customs in America, 389, 561.

Deacon—when he can baptize solemnly, 185; when administer the Eucharist, 647.

DEAF MUTE should be instructed before baptism, 439; but, if this be impossible, may be baptized conditionally, *ibid.*

DECREES of S. C. R., authority of, 26–33, 40; promulgation of, 34–36; collection of, by Gardellini, 37–38; alphabetical arrangement of, by Falise, 39; opposition between, mostly only apparent, 41.

EXORCISMS in Baptism, 302–3, 492–5.

EXSUFFLATIONS in Baptism, how made, 304, 480; in blessing the font, 552.

EXTREME UNCTION, why so called, 842; a true sacrament, 843; effects of, to strengthen the soul against temptation, 844; to remit sin, 845; to restore bodily health, 846; should be administered to the sick while they have the use of their faculties, 847, after Penance and the Viaticum; sometimes before the Viaticum, 848; but hardly ever before Penance, 849–50; though it may be valid when penance would not, there is practically no case in which absolution, at least conditionally, may not precede, 851; preparations in sick room, 904; to be explained and suggested by the pastor, 905.

—— oil of, must be blessed by the bishop, 852; in necessity, chrism may be used for, 853; blessed by priests in Greek Church 854; how kept in the church, 855; or, when necessary, in the priest's house, 856; of preceding year used only in necessity, 857; may have unblessed oil added, *ibid.*; how carried with the Viaticum, 876; when both must be carried in private, 877, 911-3.

—— subject of, must be in danger of death from existing disease, 859; must have attained the use of reason, but it may be received by children who are thought unfit for the Viaticum, 860; intention required in, 862; when administered to the insane, 863; may be administered to any dying person when he can be conditionally absolved, 864; how affected by excommunication and interdict, 865–6; should be administered to one immediately after Baptism in a dangerous illness, 867; but not to one who is danger, or even certain, of immediate death from violence, unless he has already suffered enough to cause death, 868; in case of necessity, five organs should be quickly anointed, 870; or one with a general form, 871; or, what is most advisable, the forehead, then instantly applying the thumb to one eye, the nose, lips, and one ear, while pronouncing the general form, 872; but under a condition which may be either expressed or implied, 873; (reasons for preferring this mode, 888); the same may be done in time of pestilence, 874; what if the person expires while being anointed, 875.

—— cannot be repeated while the same danger continues, but can in case of relapse after partial recovery, 878; which often happens in diseases of long duration, 880; may be repeated in doubt as to the recovery, which probably accounts for the practice adopted by many of repeating it as a general rule, after the lapse of a month, 881; cannot be repeated on account of unworthy reception, 882; or relapse into sin, 883.

—— form of, deprecative, 897; though the indicative is probably valid, 898; words not determined

like those of Baptism, 899; what words are essential, 900; at what moment is grace conferred, 901.

—— administered only by a priest, 902; the pastor, or with his leave, 903; for many centuries, by a number of priests, as it still is in the Greek Church, 906; ceremonies observed by them, 907; part taken by each priest, 908; according to present usages in Western Church, by only one priest, 909; who should, where convenient, be attended by clerics or even by other priests, 910.

—— order of, entering the sick chamber, 914; obligation of wearing surplice and stole very strict, 915-6; but cannot always be complied with, 917-9; priest presents the crucifix, sprinkles holy water, 920; and exhorts the sick, giving an opportunity of confession. 921; prayers of the ritual, antiquity of, meaning of, 922, 941; prayers of those present, 924; unctions (vid. *organs*), 925-39; order after the unctions, 940; change of gender in the prayers, 941; priest should console the sick, 943; leaving with him a crucifix and holy water, 944-5; being prepared to return and assist him in his agony, 946-7.

—— may be administered to a number together, 948-9; with certain prayers and ceremonies for all in common, 950.

Font, Baptismal—blessed on Holy Saturday and eve of Pentecost, as prescribed in the Missal, at other times as prescribed in the Ritual, 158-9, 544; should be previously well cleansed, 162, 545; film on surface of, may be removed, 163; erection of, ordered by recent synods, 238; constructed first in buildings apart from the churches, but now within, 239-40; all churches have not a right to, *ibid.*; place of, in the church, 243; material of, 244; shape and construction of, 245-7; vessel for taking the water out of, and pouring on the head, 275; vestments in blessing of, 546; procession, litany, 547-9; dividing the water, 550-1; form of insufflation, 552; infusion of the oils, 553; antiquity and mystic meaning of the ceremony, 554-5; what if there be an insufficient supply of oil and chrism, 556.

Greek Church—Euchologium or Ritual of, 4. In the Greek Church, warm water is used for Baptism, 165; the form is "*Baptizatur*", etc., in the indicative, 172; immersion usual mode of baptizing, 176; the whole body being previously anointed, 336; Confirmation and Communion administered to infants immediately after Baptism, 415-8; purification after childbirth of obligation, 559; and given only after an interval of forty days, 564; when the child must be brought to the church, 565; Communion under both species, mixed in the chalice and administered with a small spoon, 678-81; how administered to the sick, 682; Extreme Unction administered by seven or at least three priests, who bless the oil with several prayers and canticles, after which each of them anoints the sick person, 906-7.

Hands—basin for washing, where placed in baptistery, 280; imposition of, in Baptism, 310, 486; should be washed before administering Communion, 657; of a priest, how anointed, 894; imposition of, in Extreme Unction, 925; washing of, after the unctions, 940.

Holy Oils—used in Baptism

from the earliest times, 248; consecrated by the bishop on Holy Thursday, 250; should be procured by the parish priest, if possible for the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday, 251–2; if not procured in time, should be afterwards poured in "privatim et separatim", or oils of the preceding year should be used according to the different circumstances, 253; of preceding year should be burned in the lamp before the altar, 254; what if Baptism is to be conferred before the new oils are procured, 255–6; unblessed oil may be added to, but in less quantity, 257–8; what if one should be used for another by mistake, 259; shape and material of vessels for holding, 260–'1; letters to distinguish, 232; absorbed in cotton, 263; parochial supply, 264–5; how and where kept, 266; priest allowed to keep the "Oleum infirmorum" in his house, should not keep the others with it, 267, 912; laics not permitted to touch, 268; who are permitted to carry, 269; for Baptism, placed on a table near the font, 273; how poured into the font, 553–6; must not be put in the tabernacle, 612.

Infants—mortality of, 192; baptism of, before fully born, 196-9; living in the womb after death of mother, 201; how baptized in such case, 205 6; how held in Baptism, 294, 343; number of, suffocated in bed, 405; influence of nurse on, 403-'9.

Insane—baptism of the, 451–2; communion of the, 635; when anointed, 868.

Intention—in administering a sacrament, 137; actual, virtual, habitual, iuterpretative, *ibid*; explicit, implicit, 138; external, internal, 139; may affect the meaning of the form, 166.

Interrogations in Baptism—should be always put in Latin, 297–8; may they be repeated in the vernacular? 299-300; on the Creed, 340–1.

Lamp—before the Blessed Sacrament, obligation of having, 615; oil used in, *ibid.*; means of maintaining, 616; cannot be kept at night in some churches, *ibid.*; in the priest's house, 617.

Liturgy—meaning of, 2; nearly all the liturgies of the West called "Roman" before St. Pius V.; now only the corrected liturgies so called, 8.

Midwives—should be carefully instructed in the manner of baptizing, 186; only those who hold the Catholic doctrine on baptism should be permitted to act as, 187.

Milk—and honey formerly administered to the newly baptized, 420.

"Miseratur", etc.—"Indulgentiam", etc., how said, 667; in the plural though there be only one communicant, 668; but in the singular before the Viaticum, 815; Extreme Unction, 923; and the blessing in "articulo mortis", 975.

Name—given in Baptism, 291; should be a saint's, but another may be tolerated, 292–3; when there are many, all need not be mentioned in the prayers, 296.

Neophyte—newly baptized so called, 521; meaning of, *ibid.*

Organs—of sense in Extreme Unction, why anointed, 884; unction of the feet and loins not essential, 885; of the five organs, according to the more common opinion, essential, 886; various opinions on the subject, 887; of the five organs with general form,

safest and most advisable in cases of necessity, 888; highly probable that a single unction with general form suffices, 890; but not with the form appropriate to one sense, 891; usage as to the parts anointed, 892; unction of the loins omitted in many places, but should not, according to the Roman Ritual, unless in the cases mentioned by the rubric, 893; no other unction to be substituted for that of the loins, *ibid.*; of a priest's hands, 894; of the double organs, 895; when a member is wanted or redundant, 896; ordinary mode of anointing, 926; use of an instrument, 927; the eyes—manner of forming the cross, 928; and of removing the oil, 929-30; the ears, distribution of the words, 931-2; the nostrils, unction applied to each, 933-4; the mouth, 935; the hands, 936; the feet, usually the soles, 937; the loins, cases excepted, 938-9.

Parent—not permitted, unless in extreme necessity, to baptize his (or her) own child, or the child of his wife (her husband) by another, 189-90; doubtful whether an impediment to the use of marriage arises from such baptism, *ibid.*; but if the parents be unmarried, there results a diriment impediment to their subsequent marriage, which impediment it would in some cases, be sinful to contract, 191; not permitted to act as sponsor, the decision with respect to the resulting impediment being the same as when he (or she) acts as minister, 223; parents should be admonished of the danger of keeping infants in bed with them, 404-6; duties of, in selecting a nurse, 407-9.

Parishes—origin of, 100.

Parish Priest—rights of, in administering sacraments, 101; residence of, 114; should be prompt when called on, 115; bound to administer the sacraments in time of pestilence, 116; must see that the vestments and other requisites be properly kept, 129; bound to instruct the people on the efficacy, use, and ceremonies of the sacraments, 130-1; jurisdiction of, as regards confession, 141-2; rights of, as regards baptism, 184; blessing after childbirth, 563; Paschal Communion, 732-4, 752-9; Viaticum, 770-1; Extreme Unction, 903.

Paschal Communion—who are bound to receive, 731; must be received from one's own pastor or with his permission, 732-3; which may be sometimes presumed, 734; of priests, servants in monasteries, boarders in schools, 735; must be received within the Paschal time, 736; which is often extended by indult, 737; is the obligation annexed to the time? 738; obligation two-fold, 739-40; is one who has not communicated in Paschal time, bound to communicate *as soon as he can?* 741-4; practical decision, 745; is one bound to anticipate? 746; must be received worthily, 747; penalties on those who do not comply, 748-50; should be received if possible on Easter day, 751; and administered by the parish priest whose rights are specially consulted for on that day, 752; strangers to be sent to their own parish, 753; unless there be a custom or understanding admitting them, 754; or unless they have acquired a quasi-domicile or are too far from home or are "vagi", 755-9; required sometimes to go to the cathedral, 760; sick should get an opportunity of receiving, 762-'3.

PAUL V.—bull of, regarding the Ritual most probably preceptive, 65–7.

PENAL laws—made the observance of some rubrics impossible in Ireland, 80; gave rise to customs against the rubrics not easily abolished, 81–4.

"PEREGRINI"—and "advenæ" used by some in the same sense, 755; but distinguished by others, 756; how affected by the Paschal precept, 758–60.

PRINCES—children of, may be baptized in their private chapels, 241; who are to be regarded as, 242.

PUBLIC sinners — who are looked on as, 627.

PYXIS—or ciborium, material and shape of, 599, 600; veil of, 601, 663; should be blessed, 602; can be blessed by a priest who has faculties to bless vestments, *ibid*; by whom it may be handled, 603; manner of purifying, 622-'4; of holding in giving communion, 669, 716-'7; small pyxis or "custodia", 800; how carried in private to the sick, 806–7; if brought on first visit, not placed on table at once, 812, 953; manner of giving benediction with, 828.

QUAKERS — when converted, baptized absolutely, 457.

RENUNCIATIONS—in Baptism, 332, 482.

REVIVISCENCE — of Baptism, 448; dispositions required for, 449; how explained, 450; of Extreme Unction, 882.

RITE—by some distinguished from "ceremony", 5; but generally used in the same sense, 6; meaning of, *ibid.*

ROCHET—cannot be worn by priests in administering the sacraments, 121.

ROMAN RITUAL—why so called, 7; use of, according to some, not of precept, 64; but much more probably of precept everywhere in the Latin Church, 65—75; toleration of other rituals, 73; of Paul V. introduced into Ireland soon after its publication, 79; in Baptism, 284.

RUBRICS—origin and meaning of, 1; knowledge of, necessary to the priest, 9; study of, usefully connected with that of theology, 10; yet sufficiently distinct to form a special branch, 11, 12; preceptive and directive, 13, 14; regarding the sacraments mostly preceptive, 15—23; vid *Custom.*

RUBRICISTS—authority of, 89; consent of, shows the meaning of a rubric, 90; must yield to a decree of the S. C. R., 91; often divided in opinion, 92.

SACRAMENTS—Council of Trent on the ceremonies of, 16, 94–7; general definition, 98; effects of, 99; instructions on, 130–2; admonition as to the manner of receiving, 143; of which the Ritual treats, 145; matter and form of, 154-6.

—— Minister of, sanctity required in, 104–6; if conscious of mortal sin recommended to confess, though not strictly bound, 107–13; should look over the rubrics, and say a short prayer before administering, 117–8; vestments of, 119–25; how he should pronounce the form and recite the prayers, 133–4; should use the Ritual, *ibid.*; demeanour of, 135; must avoid what would leave him open to any suspicion of simony, 140.

—— form of, change in, substantial or accidental, 133; union of, with the matter, 134; condition in, how expressed, 873.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF

Rites—institution of, 25; vid. *Decrees.*

Salt—used in Baptism, mentioned by early writers, 270; special blessing for, 271; not to be given for any other use, but kept exclusively for Baptism, *ibid;* where placed in the ceremony, 274; form of blessing, 311-3; ceremony of administering, 314.

Sarum Ritual—some ceremonies of, observed in Ireland, 79.

Soutane—or "vestis talaris", ordinary dress of the priest, 119; where it is not, should be put on with the surplice in administering sacraments, *ibid.;* in the church at all times, and in the houses of the sick whenever it can be conveniently brought to them, 917; but very often it cannot, *ibid.*

Spittle—use of in Baptism, 327-8; manner of applying, 329-30.

Sponsors in Baptism—mentioned by earliest writers, 218; duties of, 219; selection of, *ibid.;* two at most should be admitted, 220; can more than two contract the relationship? 221; should be of different sexes, 222; must have attained a certain age, and have received confirmation, 224-5; conditions required to act validly as, 226; not required in private baptism, 227; required when the ceremonies are supplied, 228; who are excluded from office of, 229-31; Catholics alone can be admitted as, 232; in many dioceses secular clergy forbidden to act as, 233; can act by proxy, 234; present the infant at the church door, sometimes within, 288-9; should touch the child physically, 343; in baptism by immersion, 347; to be admonished regarding relationship contracted, 400-3; in baptism of adults, 512, 522.

Stole—how worn over the surplice, 123; over the alb, *ibid.;* different colours of, *ibid.;* prayer in putting on, 124; two required in baptism, 278; or one which may be either white or violet, but better of both colours, so that it may be reversed, 279; imposition of, in baptism, 319-21, 500; change of, 339, 510; in blessing after childbirth, 566,569; in giving communion, 658; worn by a priest in receiving communion, 676, 793; in administering the Viaticum, 798-9; in Extreme Unction, 919; in the Apostolic benediction in "articulo mortis", 969.

Surplice, worn only over the "vestis talaris", 119; variety in form of, 120; prayer in putting on, 122; alb instead of, 286; obligation of wearing, in giving Communion, 658; in administering the Viaticum, 798; and Extreme Unction, 918.

Tabernacle—keys of, 604; material and form of 605-6; must not be made the support of a sacred picture or relic, but may be surmounted by a moveable cross, 607; and serve, when required, to support the remonstrance at exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, 608; ornaments of, 609; must not let the pyxis be seen within, *ibid.;* veil of, should be, in colour, suited to the office of the day, but may be always white, 610; interior of, lined with silk, and having a corporal fitted to it, 611; should contain nothing but the Blessed Sacrament, 612; blessing of, 613; on what altar placed 614.

Table—to be placed at the door or porch, having some of the requisites in solemn baptism, 273-4; another near the font with other requisites, 278, 280; to be prepa-

red in chamber of the sick for the Viaticum, should be covered with clean linen and have on it a crucifix and two wax candles, 792; serves also for Extreme Unction, but if for Extreme Unction alone, one candle suffices, 904.

Towel—required in Baptism, 281.

Unctions—vid. *Baptism, Organs.*

Veil—or fillet after unctions with chrism, 351, 518.

Vessels—for containing the Blessed Eucharist, by the general law of the Church, should be handled only by persons in holy orders, 603; while actually containing it, can be touched only by those in deacon's orders, but when not containing it, may, according to the custom in many places, be handled by clerics, sacristans, or any person having a reasonable cause, *ibid.*; where the custom does not exist, leave should be obtained from the ordinary, *ibid.*

Viaticum—meaning of, 764; precept of receiving, 765; if one communicated through devotion in the morning, 766; should be administered before the sick lose their faculties, 767; denied to public sinners, unless they have made reparation for the scandal, 768–9; rights and duties of the pastor with respect to, 770-1; duty of warning the sick, 771; administered with the form "*Accipe frater*", etc., whenever there is probable danger of death, 772; whether the person be fasting or no, 773; may be repeated if the person desires it, 774; though not fasting, at least after an interval of some days, and in many cases even every day, 775; according to some with the form "*Corpus*

tered with an instrument? 824; ablution of the fingers, 825; given to the sick, or thrown into the fire, 826; benediction with the pyxis, 828; psalms, etc., when there is a procession back to the church—indulgences for accompanying the Blessed Sacrament, benediction, etc., 829-33; when only one particle is brought, 834; benediction is given with the hand, 835; and the pyxis may be at once purified, 837; but if more than one be brought, though privately, benediction should be given with the pyxis, 838; when administered during the last days of Holy Week, 839; "intra missam", 840; to two or more together, 841.

—— and Extreme Unction in immediate succession, to be observed in administering, 952-4; if followed by the benediction "in articulo mortis", 955-7.

WHITE garment—presented in Baptism, 282; piece of linen serves as, *ibid.*, 353; formerly worn by the neophytes for some time after Baptism, 352, 519, 524.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Pag. 56, note 1, *for* Syod. *read* Synod.
" 76, line 9, *for* riteque *read* riteque.
" 117, line 1, *for* pecter *read* pectera.
" 123, note, *for* nfra *read* ' Infra.
" 177, line 14, *for* etest *read* petest.
" 218, note 5, *for* 385 *read* 227.
" " note 6, *for* 227 *read* 385.
" 260, line 5, *after* is *dele* ,
" 264, line 14, *for* upra *read* supra.
" 280, line 26, *for* in sint. plures *read* si sint plures.
" 316, note 2, *after* n. *read* 9.
" 542, notes 4 and 5, *for* Bened. XV. *read* Bened. XIV.
" 546, line 1, *after* qui *read* in.
" 580, note 3, *for* 909 *read* 910.
" 610, line 6, *for* "*Respices quasumu*" *read* "*Respice quæsumus*".

John F. Fowler, 3 Crow Street, Dame Street, Dublin.